5083

A DEFENCE OF THE Peaceable and Friendly ADDRESS TO THE Non-Conformists; AGAINST THE ANSWER Lately given to it.

In which the Obligation to Conform to the Constitutions of the Established Church is Maintained and Vindicated. The Answerers Objections Solv'd; And his Calumnies Refuted.

Thou shalt not bear false Witness against thy Neighbour, Exod. 20. 16.

DUBLIN: Printed by *J. B.* and *S. P.* at the back of *Dick*'s Coffee-House in *Skinner-Row*, for *John Foster*, Bookseller, 1698.

ERRATA.

IN Epiſt. Ded. near the latter end, for *diſingenious* read *diſingennuous*. p. 14. l. 12. for *preposition* read *propoſition*, l. 30. for *Auther tell* read *Author tells*. p. 15. l. 16. for *proſeſſions* read *proſeſſion*. p. 22. l. 24. for *forbidded* read *forbidden*. p. 24. l. 26. for *other* read *others*, l. 40. for *theſe* read *thoſe*. p. 31. l. 31. no comma after *preſſes*. p. 48. l. 1. for *payly* read *dayly*. p. 50. l. 1. for *places* read *place*. p. 56. l. 23. for *ungratefull* read *ungratefully*, l. 38. for *bulldle* read *bundle*.

To His Grace Michael, Lord Arch-Biſhop of Ardmagh, Primate and Metropolitan of all Ireland.

My Lord,

WHen I writ my Peaceable and Friendly Addreſs to the Nonconformiſts, *it was my deſign to expreſs my ſelf ſo clearly as to give no juſt occaſion for miſtake or cavill; and ſo calmly as to give no Offence to any Man, except he would be angry with me, either for being of a different opinion from him, or elſe for fairly offering my Reaſons why I am ſo.*

I was therefore in hopes, that if any of our Nonconforming Brethren ſhould think fit to anſwer what I had written, he would lay aſide all heat and animoſity, and all ſuch Exceptions as are manifeſtly trifling and impertinent; and only urge what might be of ſome real ſtrength and moment in the Controverſy; and that with the ſame Mildneſs and Charity as I had endeavoured to do before him.

But inſtead hereof an Adverſary has lately appeared againſt me, who, as he ſeems to have but very little regard either to Charity, or even to Truth; ſo has he taken very much pains to perplex and tangle, inſtead of clearing and explaining the diſpute that is between us. And as he has raked together whatever dirt he could to throw at the Church, the Law, and Your

Grace, as well as at me (but still without any just ground for all his Calumnies) so has he, by the ambiguity of his Expressions, the intricacy of his way of Reasoning, and his Misallegations of the Holy Scripture, Raised such a mist of Sophistry in this Controversy, as may perhaps dazle the eyes of an unwary Reader, or impose upon some of his own Party, whose prejudice will not permit them impartially to consider things, but cannot, as I conceive, have any manner of Influence upon any sober and understanding Man; Except it may be to move him to have the worse opinion of that Cause, which is maintained and upheld after this manner, and of that Person, whoever he be, that thus violates the plain Laws of God, while he pretends his Conscience to be so tender as that he cannot Conform to the Constitutions of the Established Church.

To this disingenious Man I have here returned an Answer; And have done it with as much mildness as I thought the Case would bear: Yet not forbearing sometimes to express a just Indignation against such palpable prevarications as I have Convicted him of. And whatever my performance is I humbly submit it to your Graces censure: And with my most hearty Prayers for your Graces both Temporal and Eternal Happyness, I remain,

4 OC 58

Cork, October 1. 1698.

Your Graces Most Obedient

Chaplain and Most Obliged

Humble Servant

Edward Synge.

A DEFENCE OF THE Peaceable and Friendly ADDRESS TO THE Non-Conformists; AGAINST THE ANSVVER Lately given to it.

THE whole Book, againſt a part of which I am to make my Defence, conſiſts of three parts: Firſt, A Preface *to the Proteſtant Reader*. Secondly, *Animadverſions on the Defence of the Anſwer*, &c. And thirdly *An Anſwer to* my *Peaceable and Friendly Addreſs to the Nonconformiſts*. With the Second of theſe I am not concerned; And therefore ſhall ſet my ſelf to conſider only the firſt and third.

In the firſt Paragraph of the *Preface* I am repreſented as one of thoſe who *judge it their Intereſt to miſrepreſent to the World them they are pleaſed to call Nonconforming Brethren, as a Factious and Schiſmatical People*; And as a Man who am inclined to be *wiſe in* my *own conceit* (*a caſe more deſperate than that of a fool*) which therefore the Author out of *Compaſſion* to me, and ſuch as I am, *endeavours* in this his Book to *prevent*. But ſince he does not offer any inſtance of what I have ſaid or done to juſtify this odious Character

which he ventures to insinuate of me; I think it is enough for me to say that they who know me better than he can possibly do (amongst whom I believe I may reckon some of my Nonconforming Neighbours) have I hope a different opinion of me. And I entreat him to consider that as he ought not to suggest such things to the prejudice of another without very good proof (for *affirmanti incumbit probatio*, as he observes *pag.* 98.) so has our blessed Saviour pronounced a very severe Sentence against those who are so ready to give such sort of Language to their *Brother*, *Mat.* 5 22. Which title I hope I shall never justly forfeit, notwithstanding that he is pleased to let me know that he is not *fond of that Relation* to me, *pag.* 96.

Having thus suggested a very ill Character of me, which I hope I do not deserve; In the next place he gives a very good one of the Nonconformists, which I never denied but they may, and I hope they do, very well deserve. But however I think he should have taken a little better care to prevent some uncharitable misapprehensions which may be apt to arise in Mens minds, through the uncautiousness of some of those Expressions which he here makes use of. As, for Example, when he tells us that the Nonconformists *are not the idle and consuming Caterpillars of the Nation*; Does not this seem to look as if he would insinuate, either that we were such our Selves, or else had so accounted and misrepresented them? For if no one had ever thought either them or us to be *idle and consuming Caterpillers*, to what end and purpose should he so particularly inform the World that they are not such? And again (to omit other instances) when he tells us that *their fear towards God is not taught by the Commandments of Men*; would not some Men be apt to collect from hence that, in his Judgment at least, our fear towards God is taught by the Commandments of Men? For when Men do thus give Negative Characters of themselves, it is usually construed as if they intended them for positive ones of those from whom they seem thus to distinguish themselves. I am unwilling to believe that he purposely designed these and some other no less groundless than odious Insinuations against those of the Established Church, which seem to lye couched in this Paragraph: But when we consider how prevalent passion and ill nature are in some Men of all Persuasions; I think we cannot be too carefull to avoid such Expressions as may any way serve to administer false pretences to them.

But supposing this account which he has given of the Nonconformists to be no more than what in justice belongs to every sincere and well-meaning Man among them; Yet may not even such Men as these be mistaken in some things? And since I have only endeavoured fairly to lay their mistakes before them (without designing in any other thing, in the least, to detract from them) and that in such soft and gentle Language, that even this Author allows that there is *a studied Temper and Calmness in my words*, *pag.* 96. I will

appeal

appeal to the Conscience of every sober and peaceable Christian whether what I have done does any way deserve such severe and bitter Resentments as this Answer carries in it against me.

In the third and last Paragraph of his Preface he briefly sets forth the *Modesty*, as he supposes, of what the Nonconformists desire. In the former part whereof I for my part do, and always did, fully agree with him. I would indeed, if it lay in my power, persuade them all to Comform themselves to the Worship and Discipline of the Established Church; because I am of opinion that they are bound in Conscience so to do; for which I have briefly suggested my reasons in my late *Address* to them. But since all that has been said and written in this Controversy does not convince them, I think it is very fit that they should be left to *stand or fall to their own Master*: And that a full and free *Liberty* should be granted them *to serve God according to* those *Principles* which he mentions, with a *relief from* all *Penal Laws* whatsoever; As long as they are ready to give the Civil Government the same assurance that other Subjects do of their Loyal and Peaceable demeanor: And this Author does me very much wrong in endeavouring to make the World believe that I have said or suggested any thing to the contrary; as we shall more fully see hereafter. But as to the other Clause of their Petition; *viz. That no new ones be forged to their prejudice*; He has left the meaning of it so doubtful, having set it down only in those general terms; that it is not to be answered, until the sense of it be first determined. If then his meaning be *that no new* penal Laws be forged against the Non-conformists; they need not at this time make that their request; because they know very well that the contrary is not so much as thought of, or in the least proposed by any one. But if it be *that no new* Laws whatsoever *be forged* or contrived any way *to their prejudice* (which seems to be the literal purport of his words) no, not to cut them short in any thing, but that they should to all intents and purposes enjoy all manner of Priviledges, and be equally qualified with those of the Legal Church for all places and employments whatsoever (*Episcopal Grandeur, Jurisdiction and Revenue for their Ministers*, being all that he has excepted). If this I say, be the thing they would have; they may perhaps think their demands to be but *just*, because they apprehend themselves to be in the right: But it seems strange that they should give this out for so *modest a Petition* as this Author would insinuate; as if herein they asked *less* than what in reason they might; And if this be their *modest Petition*, what more will they or their successors in the next Generation proceed to demand, if ever they should venture to assume a little *Confidence*.

Having thus done with the Preface, I pass by the second part of his Book, as I said, and address my self to the third. And here the *Doctor* (as in contempt

tempt he is pleaſed to call me, for I never took the degree or paſſed by that Title) in the entrance is taxed of downright *Diſingenuity*, as having, under the Title of a *Peaceable and Friendly Addreſs to the Non-Conformiſts*, publiſhed *a Libel againſt them*; and under *a ſtudied Temper and calmneſs of Words, deſign'd a windy Storm and Tempeſt; with good Words and fair Speeches lying in wait to deceive; Having war in his heart* while *his words are ſmoother than butter*; which tho' they *were ſofter than Oyl*, yet are *as drawn Swords, while by them he is ſtirring up thoſe who bear not the Sword in vain to imploy it againſt his Nonconforming Brethren, as he calls them*, pag. 95 96. But ſince he does not ſo much as *offer* the leaſt *ſhew* of proof to make good this heavy Charge; I cannot think that any ſober man will have the worſe opinion of me for all this that he has alledged againſt me. God, who is the only ſearcher of hearts, knows that *in my heart there is no war* againſt the Non-conformiſts; Except I muſt *therefore become their Enemy becauſe I tell them the Truth*: Nor have I the leaſt deſign *to deceive* them; But on the contrary, to make them truly ſenſible of what I am perſwaded is their Duty. There is not one railing or ſcurrilous Expreſſion in all my *Addreſs* to them; and therefore why it ſhould be called a *Libel*, I cannot ſee: As for the *Stormy wind and Tempeſt* he talks of, I know not where it is, except in his own imagination; and if my words be as *drawn Swords*, it can be nothing but the Evidence of Truth, which touches his Conſcience, that makes them ſeem ſo to him; for I am ſure there is no manner of *ſharpneſs* in the Style or Language. But whereas he accuſes me of *ſtirring up* the Magiſtracy *to employ the Sword againſt them*; I deſire him to produce but one ſingle paſſage or expreſſion in my Addreſs, which does but *look that way*, and I promiſe him that I will publickly retract it: But if he cannot do this (as it is moſt evident he cannot) I leave it to his conſcience whether he ought not to beg Gods pardon for inventing ſo foul a ſlander againſt me, for which, I bleſs God, I never gave the leaſt occaſion: For to perſecute or puniſh men that are peaceable and obedient to the Civil Government, on account of their miſtakes in matters of Religion or the Worſhip of God, is what I have never failed to declare againſt whenever there was any occaſion for it. And God is my witneſs, that I had not the leaſt thought or deſign tending that way when I writ or publiſhed my addreſs to the Nonconformiſts: Nor can I imagine how any man who impartially conſiders what I have therein offered, can from thence pretend to lay the contrary to my charge.

Having formerly had the honour of being a Servant to my Lord Primate, I thought it might not be improper, when I put forth that ſmall piece, to make a publick acknowledgment of that honour and reſpect which I bear to his Grace, in a ſhort Epiſtle which I prefixed to it; Wherein amongſt other things, I judged it fit to take notice what *an Eminent example of Temper and*

Moderation

Moderation his Grace has always been, as to all men in general, ſo *to the Diſſenters* in particular: Of which I mention *his mildneſs and lenity, even in thoſe times when it was moſt in his Power to uſe ſeverity towards them*, as a very evident *Demonſtration*. Now altho' one chief deſign of this Paſſage was to recommend a mild and gentle Temper towards the *Diſſenters*, as a thing to be approved of, and imitated by all the World; yet this Author cannot let this paſs without his Animadverſion; And therefore he denies the matter of Fact, and gives this as a reaſon for it, namely, becauſe the Non-conformiſts in the North never met with greater ſeverity, than *when the Primate of all* Ireland *and Chancellor rode both upon one Horſe*, as in a courtly manner he is pleaſed to phraſe it. *pag.* 96. Now, beſides that, I have no great reaſon to believe any thing upon the teſtimony of that man, who can lay ſuch ill things to my charge, of which I know my ſelf to be altogether innocent, as I have but juſt now remarked; ſuppoſe that what he ſays were true, yet ſtill his inference plainly appears to have no more Logick than good nature in it: For if the Diſſenters were more hardly uſed, whilſt his Grace held both thoſe honourable Stations of Lord Primate and Lord Chancellor, than they had been at other times (which yet I never heard before) yet will it not follow, but that he might bear a very mild and gentle temper towards them: For it is very poſſible that ſevere methods may be uſed by a Government, and yet neither the Lord Primate, nor the Lord Chancellor, be the Promoter of them; But rather, it may be, mitigate that rigour of Law, which others perhaps might be inclined to the utmoſt to put in execution.

But he ſeems in a manner deſirous *pag.* 97. to be *put upon the proof* of what he has ſo odiouſly ſuggeſted againſt my Lord Primate. Now how well ſuch a ſpightful Task may agree with his diſpoſition, I know not: But if there were any neceſſity for ſaying ſuch ill things as he has done, both of his Grace, and of me; more then raiſing the paſſion, and embittering the temper of his Party; I think he ought to have proved them, and that beyond exception, at the ſame time when he publiſhed them to the World. For if he would not have theſe things to be believed, why does he aſſert them? But if he would, what reaſon is there why he ſhould not prove them? It cannot be any tenderneſs to his Grace's reputation, or mine; For he has endeavoured, as much as he can, to wound them by accuſing us; and what elſe it ſhould be, except the want of clear and ſufficient Evidence, I cannot imagine,

I have heard and read of grievous complaints, which both the Epiſcopal and Non-conforming Parties have made of having been hardly dealt with, either by other, as they have had the Power in their hands. Now altho' the former in this Kingdom have ever had this to plead in their Juſtification,

that they have been warranted by the Law in what they did, which the latter cannot pretend to; yet what good there can be in ripping up paſt Stories of this nature, I know not. Methinks the buſineſs of every good Chriſtian ſhould rather be to heal, than unneceſſarily to rub and fret ſuch old ſores; that peace and charity, at the leaſt, may be eſtabliſhed between us, if we cannot all come to be of one oppinion and judgment in all things. But this Author may do as his charity and diſcretion ſhall prompt him: My Lord Primate is not afraid of him; only let him ſay no more againſt him, than what he clearly proves to be true.

As a good effect of my Lord Primat's moderate and gentle behaviour while he was Biſhop of *Cork*, I took notice that *ſeveral Nonconforming Miniſters were won by him to receive Ordination at his Hands, and Conform to the Worſhip and Diſcipline of our Church.* Againſt which our Author ſuggeſts ſuch things as have neither Truth nor Charity in them. For he takes it for granted that thoſe Miniſters *renounced their former Ordination*, which was by *Presbyters*; and therefore cenſures this whole matter as the *effect not of moderation; but rather in his Grace of Prelatick Domination, and an uncharitable condemning of the Foreign Reformed Churches*, who *want Epiſcopal Ordination*: And, in the Miniſters that were ſo Ordained, of the *love of the World more than any other Arguments* that were uſed to convince them, *pag.* 97. But ſure if this uncharitable Man did not take ſome extraordinary delight to put always the *worſt* Conſtruction upon things, where any of the Eſtabliſhed Church are concerned, he would never take upon him at this rate to judge the Hearts and Conſciences of other Men, which can only be known to Almighty God; And he would have contented himſelf in ſaying that however my Lord Primate and thoſe Miniſters who were ſo Ordained might poſſibly act according to the genuine dictates of their own Perſuaſion; Yet that they were guilty of a great Error in what they did; which would have been as much as was neceſſary to be offered on his part; without an *uncharitable condemning* of his Brethren, who ought not, without evident reaſon, to be thus judged of inſincerity; being to *ſtand or fall to their own Maſter.*

But what if (after all) this matter of Fact, *viz.* that *theſe Miniſters Renounced their former Ordination*, which he ſo confidently ſuppoſes; be a meer Fable and Invention, without any other ground but ſome Mens Uncharitable Imagination? I have heard indeed this Matter, of Renouncing their former Ordination, ſometimes urged in the behalf of Presbyterian Miniſters, as ſufficient alone to juſtify their Refuſal to be again Ordained by a Biſhop: But upon the beſt enquiry that I could make I could never find that this was any more than a falſe Story Invented by ſome unpeaceable Men, in order to make a breach between the Foreign Reformed Churches and ours. For as ſuch a *Renunciation* is not in the leaſt required by any Law or Ca-

non

non of our Church, that I know of; ſo could I never yet have any credible Information that any one of our Biſhops ever inſiſted upon any ſuch thing: And the Reader may aſſure himſelf that upon this occaſion, which is now under conſideration, nothing of that nature was required or thought of.

But here perhaps I ſhall be told that our Author's meaning was no more than this, that they who ſubmitted a ſecond time to be ordained to that Office which they before had Exerciſed, did thereby, at leaſt *implicitly* renounce, and acknowledg the nullity of their former ordination. If this were all he intended, methinks he ſhould plainly have ſaid ſo, without ſeeming to inſinuate a matter of fact which is altogether falſe; However, this pretence it ſelf is eaſily anſwered. If a Man who has a good Title to an Eſtate, to obviate ſome ſcruples, or prevent ſome differences which might perhaps ariſe, ſhould accept of a new conveyance of what before was in his poſſeſſion; does it follow from hence that ſuch a man thereby renounces and diſowns his former right, and acknowledges himſelf to have unjuſtly detained what really was not his own. If a Woman who has been lawfully married, ſhould for the ſatisfaction of her Friends, who might have ſome doubts leſt all things might not have been performed as the Law required; conſent to be married again to the ſame Husband, would this be a charitable inference, from thence to conclude, that therefore ſhe *acknowledged* the nullity of her former marriage; and conſequently owned her ſelf to be a Whore? Or if a man has for ſome time had a ſufficient Commiſſion for any employment, and afterwards, for the preventing of ſome occaſional controverſy, which he foreſees may be raiſed, ſhould accept of a new one for the ſame thing, with a proteſtation that he did not thereby renounce or diſown that which he formerly had; and this proteſtation allowed of, would any honeſt or even modeſt Man pretend that this Man had yet renounced his former Commiſſion; and thereby owned all that he had done, thereby to be null and void? But that this was & is in effect the caſe of thoſe who, having been formerly ordained by Presbyters, did or do ſubmit themſelves again to be Epiſcopally ordained as our Law requires, I think does moſt evidently appear from the Senſe which my Lord Primate *Bramhall* had of the thing, and his proceeding therein (with whom I preſume it will eaſily be allowed that the preſent Lord Primate, and all the reſt of our Biſhops did, and do ſtill concurr) For, as we are told in his Life, when he required thoſe, in his Dioceſs, who before had been ordained by Presbyters, to receive Epiſcopal Ordination; they pleaded for themſelves that they were already *Miniſters of the Goſpel*, and therefore needed not again to be *Ordained* ſuch; which was the ſame thing as a *Proteſtation* againſt *Renouncing their former Ordination.* Now this their *Plea* or *Proteſtation* His Grace was ſo far from diſallowing, or requiring them who had made it to retract it; that on the contrary he rather

thier expreſſed his approbation of it on their part; In that he cauſed it to be inſerted in the Letters of Orders of one Worthy and Reverend Gentleman (And therefore I ſuppoſe of all the reſt who were in the like Circumſtances) that *he did not* take upon him *to annihilate his former Ordination, nor to determine the validity or invalidity of it; much leſs to condemn all the Ordinations of the foreign Reformed Churches, whom he leaves to their proper Judge. But* (obſerve) *only to ſupply what was formerly wanting, which the Canons of the Engliſh Church required; and to provide for the Churches peace, that Schiſm might be avoided, and ſatisfaction given to the Conſciences of the faithful; that they might not any way have a doubt of his Ordination, or reject his Paſtoral performances as if they were invalid.* And I very well remember that one of thoſe Miniſters who were re-ordained by the preſent Lord Primate, gave me once an account of what he had done much to the ſame purpoſe, and in words to this effect, *viz.* That when he firſt received Ordination from the Presbytery (in the time of the Troubles) he did it becauſe it was the beſt Authority that then he could get to empower him to ſerve God and the Church in the Office of the Miniſtry. But when the Eccleſiaſtical as well as Civil Laws were reſtored to their Force throughout the Kingdom, and Biſhops Eſtabliſhed in every Dioceſs for the Government of the Church; he ſubmitted to be again Epiſcopally Ordained, not that he renounced his former Ordination, or thought he had any reaſon to repent that, as the times then were, he accepted of it: But becauſe he looked upon it to be his Duty (now he had it in his power) to become conformable to the Laws and Canons, not of this Church only, but, as he apprehended, of the whole Ancient univerſal Church throughout the World. And now upon a due Conſideration of this whole matter I will appeal to the Conſcience even of any ſober and Charitable Nonconformiſt, whether either my Lord Primate, or thoſe Miniſters who are re-ordained by him, do deſerve ſo ſevere and bitter a Cenſure, as our Author has ventured to paſs upon them, upon the account of this Tranſaction.

Having thus animadverted upon my Title page and Epiſtle Dedicatory, he proceeds to *apply himſelf to the Addreſs it ſelf.* In which the firſt thing that I laid down, as the main Foundation of what I had to offer, was, that *it is the Duty of every Chriſtian to promote the Peace and Unity of the Church.* In anſwer to which, becauſe it was impoſſible, to make any exception to the principle it ſelf; he tells me *pag.* 97. That tho' *it hath ever been the honour of peace to be well ſpoken of by all men,* yet is it *the unhappineſs of many men to be under the Dominion of ſuch Luſts as diſenable them to purſue it.* Now if it was his deſign to include me amongſt thoſe *many men* he ſpeaks of (as every man I think will be apt to conſtrue this inſinuation) I think, in common *Juſtice,* he ought to have brought ſome ſolid proof to have made it good: But if it

was

was not his intent to reckon me in this number, methinks, in *Charity*, he ought to have ſaid ſo, and not to have given ſuch an occaſion to the world of faſtening an unjuſt aſperſion upon me. But however he might imagine hereby to bring my *Perſon* under an odium; yet what this has to do with the merit of the *Cauſe* which is in Diſpute, I know not; and therefore have no farther to ſay to it.

In the next place, in my Addreſs I take it for granted, as a thing which is *too apparent; that there is a ſeparation between the Non-Conformiſts and us; and thereby a Schiſm made in our National Church.* For the latter of which aſſertions our Author taxes me with *Confidence*, and tells me that *the Conſequence is not good*, when I would infer it from the former; Becauſe, ſays he, there *may be a ſeparation without Schiſm (as there is between all the Parochial Churches, which are locally ſeparate)* And *Schiſms where there is no ſeparation of Churches*, 1 Cor. 3. 1. pag. 98. But inſtead of juſtifying this conſequence, which he thus finds fault with, I ſhall only tell him that I never deſigned in thoſe words to advance any *Conſequence* at all. That *all Separation* does not neceſſarily imply Schiſm, I readily grant: but yet that *ſome Separations* are certainly Schiſmatical, in one or other of the ſeparating Parties, is what I preſume no man in his Wits will deny. Now that there is *ſuch a Separation* between the Non-Conformiſts and the Eſtabliſh't Church as does imply a Schiſm, was, moſt apparently, all that there I intended to ſay; Nor did I think it neceſſary by any deduction of Conſequences to prove that which I thought ſo evident as not to be denied or doubted of.

But our Author, it ſeems, will not allow that there is *a Schiſm between them and us*; becauſe *the Presbyterians in the North never joyned with the Eſtabliſhed Church in thoſe things in which we now differ; to wit, Church Government, Liturgy and Ceremonies; and all Diviſion pre-ſuppoſeth a prior Union.* To which I Anſwer, that wherever there is an *Obligation* to the maintaining of Union and Communion; if that Union and Communion be not accordingly maintained, but denied and renounced; from thence reſults what I mean by a *Schiſm*: Which word I underſtand to ſignifie not only *the Action of Dividing* or ſeparating what once was joyned and united; but alſo *the State of Separation* between ſuch Parties as ſtand obliged to Religious Union, altho' they never were actually united. Now that all Chriſtians are by the Law of God obliged, as far as lawfully they can, to maintain Union and Communion one with another, is what I never yet heard denied by any one: And ſince this Union and Communion is not maintained between the Non-Conformiſts and us, it will follow that *there is a Schiſm between us*; and that either we are guilty of a Sin, in giving them a juſt ground of keeping themſelves ſeparate from us; or they, in keeping themſelves ſo ſeparate without any juſt ground for it. But if, after all, our Author will not allow the word *Schiſm*

to be a term proper enough to denote such *a State of Separation*; I am contented that he should put what other word he pleases in the room of it, as long as the thing intended is sufficiently plain, *viz.* That such a State of Separation necessarily implies a Sin in one or other of the Parties.

For the clearer discovering at whose door the Sin of this Schism which is between us lies, I have in my *Address* proposed several things to be considered: Against the *manner* of which, first, our Author takes this exception, that I *rather Catechize the Non-Conformists by asking them Questions, than convince them by Reasons*, pag. 97. To which I Answer, that there is not any Question put in my whole Address, but what, I think, as plainly carries in it the force of an assertion, as if I had set it down, not in an interrogation, but a proposition. Nor have I there delivered or suggested any assertion but what I have given or sufficiently intimated my reason for, except the thing were so evident as to need no proof. But yet, to take away all pretence of Cavill, I shall in this *Defence* reduce my Questions into such Propositions as are naturally implyed in them; and fairly examine which are strongest, my Reasons for them, or his against them.

The first Proposition then which, on this occasion, I have advanced (tho' under the form of a Question) is, that *in the Communion of our Church there is nothing wanting which is necessary to the Salvation of a Christian*: And as I have constantly served *my Cure* in my own Person. (Notwithstanding our Authors uncharitable Insinuation to the contrary, *pag.* 98.) So have I in my *Address* suggested such proof of this assertion, as not to stand in need of him for my Curate or *Delegate* to prove it for me, *viz. Because our Church Teaches all the Fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith; requires all Men to lead Vertuous and Holy Lives, and omits no part of Christ's Institution, either in Baptism or the Lord's-Supper*; *which things are all that are required, as of necessity, to any Mans Salvation.* Nor did I think it proper to offer any further Confirmation of these things, besides the notoriety of them; because I was not Disputing with *Jews* or *Pagans*; to whom our Auther tell us *Christ and his Apostles proved their Doctrines*; But with the *Non-Conformists*, who do not deny what I have hitherto asserted (as the others did the Doctrines of the Gospel) but give other Reasons altogether for their separation from us: And therefore why our Author would have me stand to prove these Points, before they are gainsaid, I know not; except it may be to divert the Reader from attending unto that which is the knot and difficulty of the controversy; if any real difficulty at all there be in so very plain and evident a Case.

Where an assertion is laid down in any Controversy, there can be but two ways of returning an Answer to it, *viz.* either first, to deny the Truth of it; or secondly, to shew that tho' it may be true, yet is it impertinent to

the

the purpose for which it is alleged. The former of these, our Author, I suppose, knows he cannot do in relation to the above-mentioned *Proposition*. (Altho', according to his way, he seems to *suggest* something like it, by urging me to undertake the proof of it. For the only reason why a man should produce his Arguments to prove a thing, is because it may be denied or doubted of.) But in order to the latter, without distinguishing between the case of our Church, and that of *Rome*, he produces, *pag.* 99. a passage of *the Learned Chillingworth*, which tho' levelled by its Author only against the Roman Church, yet, he sets down as equally applicable against that Church also of which Mr. *Chillingworth* himself was a Member; And that without taking any care to caution his own Party against an unjust and false Opinion, that some of them have seemed to be inclined to; as if the Church of *Rome* and the Establish't Church were in a manner equally culpable. The substance of what he recites out of Mr. *Chillingworth*, is comprised in the first words of the Quotation it self; *All*, says he, *that we forsake in you is the Belief, Profession and Practice of your Errors, &c.* Let but these *Errors* be taken away, and in all the rest we shall agree very well. In Answer whereunto, I grant with that Learned man, in what follows, That *to believe an Error, knowing it to be an Error, is absolutely impossible; and for a man to profess what he does not believe, is Hypocritical and Sinful*; and therefore ever to be avoided. But altho' this bears close upon the Church of *Rome*, which requires the Belief and Profession of divers things, which from plain Scripture and Reason we abundantly prove to be false; yet is it altogether wide from our case, except our Author had plainly told us (as we do the Papists) *what those Errors or false Doctrines are, the Belief or Profession of which we require among the Conditions of our Communion:* Which till he undertakes to do, he must, I think, acknowledge that what Mr. *Chillingworth* says, as to the *Believing* and *Professing* of Errors, is no way to his present purpose, except it be to amuse and keep up the prejudice of his own Party against us.

But that Learned man excepts against *Practising*, as well as against *Believing* or *Professing* of Errors. Now if by *Practising an Error* be meant the doing any thing which is contrary to God's Law; such as praying to Saints, or worshipping the Host or Images, to which, and such like things, undoubtedly he had an Eye in that Expression; I grant that it is a cause abundantly sufficient to refuse the Communion of any Church, if she requires any such *Practice* as a Condition of it: But then it must be shewn that some such Practice is so required by our Church, or else this Clause will be as little to the purpose as the former. But if by *Practising an Error* be meant the doing of a thing which is not Sinful, but yet is apprehended to be improper or inconvenient; and therefore may be accounted an Error in Point, not of lawfulness, but of prudence, decency or the like; If any Church requires

the

the practice only of such an Error as this; however it may be proper to desire, and with a modest earnestness to press for an alteration in such things for the better, yet I cannot see how upon this ground it can be justified to renounce or refuse the Communion of such a Church: But of this, anon.

As to Mr. *Chillingworth*'s Proposal to the Papists, that he was ready to join with them in any such *Form of Worshipping God*, as should be *wholly taken out of the Scriptures*. If the same be made to us; I Answer, that if by *a Form of Worship wholly taken out of the Scriptures* be meant such an one, every of whose *Words* and *Expressions* are immediately and in terms contained in the Scriptures; the thing is hardly practicable: For as it is possible that the very Words and Phrases of Scripture may be so joined and put together, as to wrest and pervert the sense and meaning thereof, which might easily occasion new Disputes: So I believe will it be very difficult (nor certainly is it necessary) for any Church so to contrive all her Forms of Worship, as to use no word or action in any of them: but what is expressly contained in or prescribed by the Scripture. But if such a Form be meant, which, for substance, is wholly taken from the Scripture, and has nothing, either in its concomitant actions or expressions, which is contrary to the Scripture; which I believe was all that Learned man intended; I accept the proposal; and offer our Liturgy as such a Form of worship (as undoubtedly Mr. *Chillingworth* judged it to be, or else he would not have conformed to it). And if then our Author cannot shew that there is something therein contained, and thereby required, which is contrary to the holy Scriptures; he must, I think, by his own Confession, be judged guilty of Schism, for refusing to join with us in the use of it.

The second proposition which in my Address I offer (and that also couched under a Question) is that *nothing which is Sinful is required by us from those who communicate with us.* For which I there offer this as my reason, namely, *because none of our constitutions are forbidden by the Law of God, and nothing can be a Sin but what is so forbidden.* To this he Answers, *pag.* 100. that there are such things required by our Church as *to them* are sinful; and some of our constitutions which *to them do appear* to be contrary to God's Law. For the proof of which he lays down, *p.* 101 a distinction, rational indeed in it self, but here, I think not rightly applyed, namely that *things are forbidden either expressly, or by just and necessary consequence.* That some of our constitutions then, tho' not *expressly*, are yet *by good consequence forbidden*, he endeavours to prove, because *being not commanded by God, they are* yet *required by men, as parts or means of the Worship of God.* Which as he pretends is contrary to the Word of God; and, for the proof of what he says, he produces some Texts of Scripture, and then confirms all by the Authority

of

of my Lord *Bishop of Derry*, in his late *Discourse of Humane Inventions, &c.*

In that Paragraph of my *Address*, now under consideration, I had called those Rites and Ceremonies, which by Authority are appointed to be used, by the name of *Circumstances of God's Worship*; and as such asserted the lawfulness of them. Now whereas he would prove the unlawfulness of these things as being required, *not as Circumstances, but as parts and means of the Worship of God*: He ought very clearly and distinctly to have told us what he meant by a *Circumstance*, what by a *Part*, and what by the *Means* of Worship; and how these are distinguished one from another: For as long as these terms, in which he seems to place the knot of the Controversy, remain obscure, it is not possible to clear the Dispute, or rightly to apply the proofs which he brings: And yet without any explication of these terms, or shewing wherein the things signified by them do differ one from another, he proceeds to prove, *pag.* 102, that our Rites and Ceremonies are with us both *Parts* and *Means of God's Worship*. But that we may not be like men who are scuffling in the dark, and not distinctly knowing what it is we contend about; I must, as I proceed, endeavour to do what he has thought fit to leave undone; I mean to state the signification of these words, that thereby we may know the difference of the things one from another.

(It being then premised, what all, I suppose, will grant, that the true Worship of God consists in those things, and in those only, which he himself has commanded) That (and nothing else but that) is properly to be called *a Part* of any thing, without which the *thing* would be in *it self* imperfect and defective. Thus every Limb of a Man is a *Part* of him, because the want of any of them would be a defect in the Man himself: But his garment, tho' a decent ornament, is yet no part of him, because if he were stript stark naked, or cloathed in an undecent garb, tho' this might perhaps expose him to the scorn of some men; yet would he *in himself* be never the less a perfect and compleat man upon that account. Thus also Prayer, Thanksgiving, Confession, the Susception of Baptism, and the receiving the Lord's-Supper, are each of them *Parts* of God's Worship; because he who omits any one of them, in its proper season, thereby renders his Worship, *in it self*, defective and imperfect. But the outward Modes or Ceremonies, which may be annexed to this Worship or any part of it, are not themselves any part of the Worship (altho' they may be a decent ornament of it) because the absence of them (altho' it might perhaps, in some mens eyes, render the Worship mean and contemptible, yet) would not make it, *in it self*, to be ever the less compleat, perfect, or acceptable to Almighty God. If then our Author can prove, that it is the Judgment of our Church

that the laying aſide of any of her Ceremonies would render the Worſhip of God, *in it ſelf*, imperfect or defective then, and not till then, he may truly lay it to her charge that ſhe requires theſe Ceremonies *as a part of God's Worſhip*.

But *the Liturgy*, ſays he, *is a part of the Worſhip of God, and theſe Ceremonies are a part of the Liturgy, therefore*, &c. I anſwer, that the *ſubſtance and purport* of our Liturgy, *viz.* Confeſſion, Prayer, Thankſgiving, *&c.* are indeed *parts* of the Worſhip of God; for without any one of them the Worſhip would be imperfect: But the particular words, in which theſe Devotions are there expreſt, and the concomitant Ceremonies which are preſcribed to be uſed, are not, nor ever were, by our Church eſteemed *as parts of Worſhip*; but only as the *Modes*, *Regulations* and *Method* of it, alterable in themſelves by humane authority, and variable in divers particular Churches, without making thereby any alteration or variation in the *ſubſtance* of the Worſhip. Altho' therefore, our Author's proofs, as he has managed them, are but very lame; yet becauſe the thing is true, I freely grant, that to require any thing *as a part of God's Worſhip*, which he himſelf has not commanded, is utterly unlawful; But then it is moſt evident from what I have ſaid, that our Liturgy or Ceremonies are no way concerned herein.

Well, but if they are not to be eſteemed as *parts*, yet he will prove that they are required as *means* of the Worſhip of God, which is altogether as bad. Let us therefore enquire into the ſenſe and ſignification of this word alſo.

To explain this word *means*, he adds, *p.* 102, the word *ways* to it; and tells us that our Liturgy and Ceremonies *are reputed ways and means of the Worſhip* of God: Now the *way* of doing a thing always denotes, not directly the action it ſelf, but the *method* and *manner* of performing it; one and the ſame action for ſubſtance, being often capable of being performed after *divers ways* or manners. I agree with him therefore that our Liturgy and Ceremonies are to us, as the Directory to him, the *way*, *means* or *method* of our publick Worſhip of God: But yet the premiſſes out of which he infers this concluſion, are ſo crude and confuſed, that they are by no meaus to be admitted into diſcourſe, much leſs granted as truth, until their meaning be diſtinctly cleared, *viz. becauſe*, ſays he, *no ſolemn publick Worſhip can be performed, nor Sacraments adminiſtred without them*: By which if he means that our Church has ſuch an opinion of her Liturgy and Ceremonies, as to think it impoſſible, *in it ſelf*, rightly to Worſhip God or adminiſter the Sacraments without them; it is notoriouſly falſe: But if he means no more than this, namely, that we judge that every man, who is ſubject to the authority of the law of the Land, is bound in Conſcience always to perform the publick Worſhip of God, and Celebration of the Sacraments, according to that manner preſcribed in our Liturgy; this obligation ariſing not from the *nature* of the particular

particular Forms and Ceremonies there enjoyned, nor from any *particular* command of God appointing them; but only from the general Law of God, which requires Obedience to be paid to our lawful Superiors, and from the Laws of the Land consequent thereto; and therefore lasting no longer than such Laws of the Land shall remain in force: If this, I say, be all he means, we grant it, and are ready to justifie our Judgment in this matter.

But here he presses me with a great absurdity as he thinks; *If all Ministers*, says he, *should refuse to say Common-Prayer or administer the Sacraments, with all these Ceremonies, then, according to the Act of Uniformity, it would be unlawful to Worship God publickly in this Kingdom.* Now if he would infer from hence, that therefore our Liturgy ought to be abolished; by the same reason it will follow, that no Law whatsoever must any where be made for the Regulating the Worship of God, or administration of the Sacraments. For if all Ministers should refuse, to celebrate the publick Worship, and administer the Sacraments according to that Law; then, according to that Law, it would be unlawful to Worship God publickly in that Kingdom or Common-wealth where any such Law should be Enacted. A consequence fit only for such wild Sectaries as would reject all rules of order and decency, and follow their own extravagant fancies only in maettrs of Religion and the Worship of God.

But let us for once put this mad supposition with him *that all Ministers should refuse to officiate according to our Liturgy*: What would be the consequence? or what must be done in such a case? I answer, if such a refusal should proceed from wilfulness, it would be a great sin in the Ministers that refused; but if from want of information or due apprehension, it would only be a sin of Ignorance, and therefore more easily pardonable before God. But in such an extraordinary case, the necessity of things would probably put the Government upon some speedy Resolution, either of providing other Ministers, if all those lately in office should, on a suddain, lose their Wits; or else of altering their Ecclesiastical Laws, in condescension to the infirmity of their Ministers, rather than the publick Worship of God and administration of the Sacraments should cease among them.

But because I call the Ceremonies prescribed by our Liturgy *circumstances in the worship of God*, which he will not allow that they are; it will not be amiss to explain what is meant by the word *circumstance*. Whatsoever then is a means or concomitant of any action, but no *part* of the action it self; that I call (and so I thing do all People) a circumstance of it. Thus for example: To travel from *Dublin* to *Drogheda* is an action; but to go either on foot, or on horseback, or in a coach, to wear a cloak and boots, or not to wear them, and the like, are only *circumstances* of this Journey: for a man is said never the more or the less to travel, whatever conveniencies he may

have

have or want for the performance of his Journey. Thus alſo to Worſhip God is an action; but to perform this Service either by a Printed Form of Words, or by no ſet Form at all, to wear a black or a white garment, to kneel or to ſtand at the time of doing it, and ſuch like things, are no more but *circumſtances* of this Worſhip; becauſe a man may truly and acceptably Worſhip God in any of theſe ways, if the ſubſtance of his Worſhip be right, and his heart be rightly diſpoſed (altho', for decency ſake, it is very fit that in a Congregation there ſhould be ſome ſettled Uniformity in theſe things), and an aggregate of theſe circumſtances taken together, is what is uſually called the *way* of doing a thing. Thus if it be asked which way (I do not mean by what road, but in what manner) did ſuch a man travel to *Drogheda?* It may properly be anſwered, he went on foot, with a coat to keep him from the rain and cold, and carried his proviſion with him; or he went on horſeback, or in a coach, and had ſuch and ſuch conveniencies for his Journey. Thus alſo if we were inquiring after the Worſhip of any Church or Party whatſoever, the natural order of our Queſtions would be this: Firſt to ask whom they Worſhipped? *viz.* whether the true God or a falſe God, or any other Perſon beſides God: And if it appeared that they Worſhipped the true God, then the ſecond thing to be asked would be wherein does that Worſhip which they pay to God conſiſt? Do they confeſs their Sins, and Pray to him, and give him Thanks? Are they Baptized, and do they celebrate the Lord's-Supper according to God's own command? And if we ſhould find that in all this they followed the rule of God's word; then in the third place this Queſtion would fall in, *viz.* After what *way* and manner, or by what means, or in what method, do they pay and perform this Worſhip? What time, what place, what words, what geſtures, *&c.* do they appoint or uſe in the ſeveral parts of it.

Thus far then our Author and I are agreed, *viz.* Firſt, That to preſcribe any thing *as a part of God's Worſhip* which he himſelf has not commanded, is a ſin. But then I have ſhewn that our Forms and Ceremonies are not by us made *ſuch parts* of the Worſhip of God. Secondly, I agree with him, that our Liturgy and Ceremonies are the *way*, *means* or method of performing our publick Devotions: But then I have alſo ſhewn that this ſignifies no more but that theſe things, which are thus by humane Law preſcribed, are the *circumſtances* which do accompany and regulate the *manner* of our Worſhip. Now if our Author's proofs do evince, that to require any thing, which God himſelf has not commanded, as a *way or means* of Worſhip, renders the thing it ſelf unlawful, and in effect forbiden, without any other prohibition of it; then I muſt confeſs he has not only ſufficiently anſwered my *Addreſs to the Non-Conformiſts*, but alſo over-turned all the Liturgies and Rituals, not of our Church only, but of all other Churches alſo: Nay, I do not well ſee how the

the Directory it self will escape the stroke of so strict a Censure; except he were able to shew, that every Punctilio which is there prescribed, is no more than what is (I must not say allowed and left at liberty but) positively commanded by God.

And as those Arguments, upon the strength of which we renounce the Communion of any Church, and refuse Obedience to the Law of the Land, ought to be both very clear and very solid; so, that I may not abate the force of those which our Author brings, I shall set them down in his own words, without omitting a syllable.

First then, says he p. 101. *whatever* [*part or*] *means of divine Worship is not commanded, is forbidden, is evident from that reason given* Lev. 10. 1. *why God destroyed* Nadab *and* Abihu, *for offering strange fire; which is this: For I commanded them not.* Now (besides that he perverts the Text by adding the word *for* to make the words run in an argumentative Style, which are only part of an Historical Narration; and by putting the word *I* instead of *he*, as if those words were immediately spoken by God himself, whereas they are only a part of that Relation which *Moses* makes of the matter of fact). The Case of *Nadab* and *Abihu* was plainly this: God had commanded that when Incense was to be burnt before him, it should be done with Fire *taken from off the Altar*, as appears from *Lev.* 16. 12. But these men, neglecting the Command of God, put other *Strange* Fire into their Censers; for which they were destroyed by *Fire from the Lord.* Lev. 10. 1, 2. All then that can be inferred from hence, is, that whosoever shall omit to do what God Commands, as *Nadab* and *Abihu* did, to take Fire from the Altar; and *instead thereof*, shall do another thing which God has not commanded, as they did in putting strange Fire in their Censers; is guilty of a sin: But where nothing is omitted which God has commanded, it does not follow from hence, that the doing of any thing which is uncommanded, in the Worship of God, is therefore unlawful, because it is not commanded. But if he shall tell me that the Command for taking fire from the Altar was not given, for ought that appears, till after the death of *Nadab* and *Abihu*; I shall desire him to let me know, if there were no certain sort of Fire at that time ordained and appointed for the burning of Incense; how could that Fire which these men offered be termed *Strange Fire?* For the word *Strange* necessarily implys that there was some other Fire which was *not Strange*, which they ought to have offered, that is to say, some certain sort of Fire particularly appointed for this purpose.

His next Argument is this. *The reason*, says he, *of Gods rejecting what was offered*, Is. 1. 12. *is given*; *Who hath required these things at your hands.* To which I answer, that the things there spoken of, and which God at that time rejected, were such as he had positively commanded and *required*

from the people of Iſrael; namely, *Sacrifices*, *burnt-Offerings*, *Incenſe*, &c. as every man that reads the precedent and following Verſes may plainly ſee. The reaſon then why God rejected them could not be, as our Author would inſinuate, becauſe he had not *required* them (for 'tis plain that he had required them in the Moſaick Law). But becauſe the People reſted in theſe outward performances; and were not truly ſanctified in their hearts, nor holy in their lives, which was what he chiefly, and ſo in a manner *only*, required from them, as in compariſon thereof almoſt not to regard thoſe outward Performances, altho' of his own appointment. That this is the plain and only purport of that place, appears ſo evidently from the Context and whole deſign of that Chapter, that it is not to be imagined how any man could miſtake it, except he did it wilfully: And all that can be inferred from this whole Paſſage, is, that outward Performances, altho' of God's own Appointment; are yet of no eſteem with him, if they are not accompanied with true Holineſs of Mind and Actions. Which how it can be applied to our preſent Controverſy, I am at a loſs to find.

His next Argument is this, *The cauſe of God's Judgments on falſe Prophets* Jer. 14, 14, 15. *is, I ſent them not, neither have I commanded them.* Now obſerve the Conſequence: God Almighty denounces a heavy Judgment upon thoſe pretended Prophets, who, being *not ſent nor commanded* by him, did yet preſume, not only to tell *Lyes*, but alſo to *Propheſy* them *in his Name*, which was a moſt abominable Sin; and from hence our Author would infer that therefore whatſoever is not commanded in the Worſhip of God, is forbidden to be uſed, as a way or means of it. But how this Inference, or any thing like it, can be juſtified, I know not.

His laſt Argument is this; *Fear or Worſhip of God taught by the Commandments of Men is not only vain*, Matth. 15. 9. *but brings Plagues on them who abuſe their wiſdom that way.* Iſ. 29. 14. Where tho' he very crudely and indiſtinctly repreſents the meaning of the former of theſe two Texts which he alleges; yet I freely grant the truth of what he aſſerts, if the thing be rightly underſtood. But where the fear of God proceeds from an awful ſenſe of his Greatneſs and Majeſty; and the Worſhip of God is ſuch as he himſelf has taught and preſcribed; conſiſting in Confeſſion, Prayer, Thankſgiving, and the Celebration of Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper, without omitting any thing which is of divine Inſtitution; And Men are taught and urged thus to Fear and Worſhip God, becauſe God himſelf has commanded them ſo to do; And the Law of the Land (which may be termed the *Commandment of Man*) interpoſes no farther, but only to enforce, and not to alter, the Law of God, and to ſettle and regulate the outward Circumſtances of this Worſhip; which the Law of God has not determined; I cannot ſee what from either of theſe Texts can with any colour be object-

ed againſt ſuch a conſtitution of things as this; except it be where prejudice, and not ſober and impartial reaſon, is the Interpreter of them.

To ſtrengthen theſe his proofs from Scripture (which of themſelves I am ſure are very weak) our Author adds, that *we are lately taught* what he has aſſerted, *to be the Doctrine of the Eſtabliſhed Church, by the Biſhop of* Derry, *in his Vanity of Humane Inventions.* And after having recited ſome of His Lordſhip's words out of the Introduction of the Book mentioned; he concludes thus: *Now, if Croſs, Ring,* &c. *be not expreſly contained in* Scripture, *or warranted by the Examples of holy Men therein, they muſt, according to the Biſhop of* Derry's *reaſoning, be diſpleaſing to God, and ſo forbidden by him.* p. 101, 102. But here ſure our Author cannot but know that he is guilty, in a moſt palpable manner of a double piece of diſingenuity. For neither does my Lord Biſhop of *Derry* there *teach* us that what is contained in thoſe words is the *Doctrine of the eſtabliſhed Church*, but only offers his own judgment of thoſe things, as being highly reaſonable; nor does our Author faithfully recite what his Lordſhip has ſaid; but omits part of the laſt Sentence, without which it is not poſſible fully to underſtand the meaning and deſign of that Paragraph. His Lordſhips Concluſion is this, *Since God has vouchſafed us a certain Direction for his Worſhip in the holy Scriptures; it is to be ſuppoſed that all ways of Worſhip are diſpleaſing to him that are not expreſsly contained, or warranted by Examples of holy Men mentioned therein*; OR MAY NOT BE DEDUCED BY PLAIN CONSEQUENCE, OR BY PARITY OF REASON FROM THEM (which laſt words our Author has very unfairly left out) ſo that altho' our Ceremonies *be not expreſsly contained in the Scriptures, or warranted*, in particular, *by the Examples of holy Men therein*; Yet ſtill, according to my Lord Biſhop of *Derry*, (in that very Paragraph which our Author quotes) *they may not be diſpleaſing to God, if they can be deduced by plain Conſequence, or by parity of reaſon from them.* And that all our Forms and Ceremonies are juſtified by plain *Conſequences*, or an evident congruity and *parity of Reaſon*, either from the Rules or Examples of holy Men in Scripture, is what his Lordſhip has partly proved in the Sequel of that Book, and may very effectually be made good touching thoſe other things of which he has not there had occaſion to ſpeak.

From what our Author has hitherto been diſcourſing, he p. 102. infers an Anſwer to this Queſtion which I had put, viz. *Can any thing be called a Sin which God has not forbid?* And he tells me, *It may: For*, ſays he, *uncommanded Worſhip is Sin.* Now ſee how an ill cauſe runs a man into Perplexities and Contradictions: He had juſt before been proving that *uncommanded Worſhip is forbidden*; and, yet, almoſt in the ſame breath he gives it as an Inſtance of a thing that is a Sin, altho' it be *not forbidden.* But altho' I have already granted that the uſe of any *uncommanded* thing, *as a*

part

part of God's Worſhip, is unlawful (and the only reaſon why it is ſo, is, becauſe it is forbidden) yet neither does it follow from hence, nor has our Author proved that *uncommanded Circumſtances of Worſhip are ſinful:* And upon a Suppoſition that they were ſinful; yet upon what other account they could be ſo beſides their being forbidden, I ſhould be very glad to learn from him.

But he gives another Inſtance. *To Baptize*, ſays he, *without the Sign of the Croſs, Communicate without Kneeling*, &c. *are not forbidden of God, and yet the Eſtabliſhed Church accounts theſe Sins.* To which the Anſwer is very eaſy, *viz.* That the Eſtabliſhed Church accounts theſe things to be no farther Sins than *as they are forbidden by God.* Diſobedience to lawful Authority, in ſuch things as are in themſelves lawful, is moſt certainly forbidden, ſince then the Croſs after Baptiſm, Kneeling at the Communion, &c. are in themſelves lawful, and commanded by lawful Authority; For any man, *wilfully*, to omit any of theſe Circumſtances, in the performance of theſe Offices, as long as the Laws for them do ſtand in force, is an Act of Diſobedience to the higher Powers; and, upon this account, and no other, is reckoned as a Sin by us.

But, *Nonconformity*, with us, *is puniſhed more ſeverely than ſome groſs Immoralities*! I anſwer, that tho' this were true, yet makes it nothing to our preſent Controverſy; nor can it any way be proved from thence, that Conformity is unlawful; and therefore, for what purpoſe this is here mentioned, except it be to raiſe the paſſion, and thereby more effectually to cloud the reaſon, of his own Party, I cannot imagine. What ever errors there may be in the *Diſcipline* of a Church (as no Humane Conſtitution perhaps was ever throughly perfect) if ſome part of it be too ſtrict, and other too looſe; or whatever elſe the fault may be; I think it is the Duty of every good Chriſtian, fairly to repreſent ſuch things to thoſe who are in Authority, that they may in a due manner be rectified. But as ſuch defects as theſe, are no juſt ground to refuſe the Communion of any Church whatſoever; ſo to upbraid her with them upon an improper occaſion; and when ſuch a reproach makes nothing to the Argument in hand; in my apprehenſion, ſeems not altogether agreeable to the true Chriſtian ſpirit of meekneſs and Charity.

That this hint then which he here gives is not to the direct purpoſe of our preſent Diſpute, is moſt plain. But what if, after he has affirmed it ſo poſitively, and that too with an Aſſeveration, it ſhould not appear to be ſo clear and evident a truth as he ſuppoſes it. He tells us, that *for Nonconformity Men are to be Excommunicated, Ipſo facto, But not for ſome groſs Immoralities.* Now beſides that the *Ipſo facto*, upon which he lays ſuch a Streſs, is wanting in theſe Canons of the Church of *Ireland*, which are made concerning this matter (which is enough to render his Alle-

Allegation false, because our present controversy is confined within the bounds of this Kingdom). Let him but consult the second and third Paragraphs of the Rubrick, which is placed immediately before our Communion Service, and there he shall find that *notorious evil livers*, who are the same with those who are guilty of *gross immoralities*, are to be excluded from the Holy Communion; and an *account* of them to be forthwith *given to the Ordinary, who is to proceed against* such Persons, *according to Canon*; which I think is much the same thing with an Excommunication *ipso facto*.

But, it may be, I shall be told that tho' our Ecclesiastical Laws may perhaps be found to be equally severe against immorality and Nonconformity, yet we do not find that the former has been so strictly punished amongst us as the latter. To which I answer, that if this were true it may be indeed justly accounted as a great fault in those whose Office it was to put those Laws in Execution; but ought not to be charged upon the Constitution of the Church it self. And, besides this, it is not so easy a matter legally to punish many immoralities, as at the first one would be apt to think. For without sufficient proof, punishment ought not to be inflicted; and not only are People generally very unwilling to appear, as witnesses against others in such cases as these; But Men also do commonly take care, so far to hide their Acts of wickedness, as to make it very difficult to produce any legal proof of such things against them, altho' at the same time they may labour under great suspicion and much Scandal upon that account: Which I take to be the great cause why sometimes the best of Men, when they have been in Authority, have not been able, with all their care and diligence, to suppress vice, as both the Laws have empowered and their own inclinations led them. To conclude this digression: As every honest Man ought sincerely to desire and heartily to contribute his endeavours that true piety may be promoted, and all wickedness suppressed; so I for my part am fully of opinion that no sober and peaceable Man should at all be punished, on account of the mistakes of his Conscience, for which reason I am altogether for having the penalty of our Laws against Nonconformity wholly relaxed: Which yet I think ought to be done with that cautious prudence, as that all publick disturbances, both now and hereafter, may, as much as is possible, be prevented; And, under the pretence of easing tender Consciences, a free liberty ought not to be given to every one at pleasure *who want only to insult and trample upon a legal Establishment.*

Our Author proceeds and tells us that *Oile, Salt, Chrism, Spittle, &c. are no more forbidden than the Sign of the Cross*: *Why then* says he *hath the Church rejected them?* To which the Church has long since given a clear and satisfactory answer, in a short discourse prefixt to the Book of Common Prayer; which bears this Title *Of Ceremonies why some be abolished and some retained*;

with which if he were not ſatisfied, he ought to have made his exceptions againſt it, before he had again renewed the Queſtion. But *the ſame Arguments are uſed by the Papiſts for all their Ceremonies*; I anſwer if the Arguments are bad, let him refute them; But if not, why are they the worſe becauſe the Papiſts make uſe of them? And as the Papiſts, to run down Proteſtancy, do not ſcruple vigorouſly to plead the Cauſe of the *Socinians*; by racking their Wits to ſhew that the Doctrine of the bleſſed *Trinity* is liable to as many and as great ſeeming abſurdities as that of *Tranſubſtantiation*, ſo it ſeems ſome Nonconformiſts, in order to gain their point againſt the Eſtabliſhed Church, do perform no mean piece of Service for the Church of *Rome*, in endeavouring to perſwade the World that the caſe of that Church and that of our Eſtabliſhed one, are very near of kin. But as I have already ſhewn that what our Author has quoted out of Mr. *Chillingworth* againſt them is no way to be applyed to us; ſo between their Ceremonies and ours, both as to the exceſſive number and great abuſe of them, there is ſuch extraordinary difference (as our Church takes notice in the place, but now quoted) that I wonder how any Ingenuous Man could offer to make a Parallel between them. And as for what he adds in the Concluſion of this Paragraph, that, *ſelling Doves and changing Money were not forbidden, yet Chriſt drove all out of the Temple*; I anſwer, that thus to make a Market of that place which was dedicated and appropriated to the ſervice of God, was, if not in expreſs words, yet by very good conſequence, forbidden; As our Saviour ſhews, *Matth.* 21 13. Or if it were not forbidden, I deſire to know upon what account were they to be blamed, who there ſold Doves and changed Money. And let him but prove that any of our Ceremonies are equally forbidden, and I will renounce them. Or if he cannot do this; to what purpoſe is this inſtance given, except it be to keep up an unreaſonable prejudice againſt our way of Worſhip?

To vindicate our ſelves from the imputation of *Superſtition* in the *uſe* of Ceremonies, as well as our Ceremonies themſelves from that of *unlawfulneſs*, I took notice, in my Addreſs, that *we have ſufficiently declared that we place no holineſs in them; but only uſe them as things in themſelves indifferent, ordained by authority for decency and order, and alterable at any time by the ſame authority.* From whence our Author, ſmartly, as he thinks, infers upon me, *pag.* 103. that *if* our Ceremonies *be not holy, they are not civil, nor natural ones, and therefore muſt be prophane.* But is not this meer trifling, thus to perplex a diſpute with variety of terms, without explaining and determining the ſenſe of them? For had he but laid down the definitions and diſtinctions of and belonging to theſe things, this pretence would immediately appear to be vain and ridiculous, Whatever Ceremony is commanded by *God* to be uſed; as long as the obligation of that command

laſts,

laſts, may properly be called *holy*; whatſoever ſuch is commanded by *the Law of the Land only*, altho' to be uſed in the exerciſe of Religion, may, yet, if you pleaſe, be called *a civil Ceremony*. And, where the Chriſtian Religion is not upheld by the Civil Authority, whatſoever is appointed by *the Church it ſelf* may reaſonably be termed by the name of *Eccleſiaſtical*: And, to give no more inſtances, where bare *cuſtom* without any other inſtitution has introduced the practice of any ſuch thing; if there be nothing therein which is ſinful, why may it not bear the name of *cuſtomary*? From whence it will evidently appear that if either our Author's Logick or Charity had not been ſomething defective, he needed not ſo haſtily to have concluded our Ceremonies to be *Prophane*, becauſe we place no *holineſs* in them; but might have found out ſome other appellation for them. But ſince the pretended *Popery* and *Idolatry* of our Ceremonies has been ſo ſhamefully confuted; it may perhaps be a pretty new hint to give thoſe People who are diſaffected to them, to tell them that we do in effect own them to be *Profane*, becauſe we place no *holineſs in them*.

But ſtill, ſays he, *they cannot be free from Superſtition, if they are ſuperadded as parts of Worſhip!* But I have ſhewn that they are *not ſuperadded as parts of Worſhip*: And if he had but enquired into the true notion of *a part of Worſhip*, as it is diſtinguiſhed from the *Circumſtances* of it, he could not in modeſty have inſiſted upon ſuch a poor pretence.

In the remaining part of this paragraph he offers three things more, by way of anſwer to what I had above affirmed. The firſt is, That *tho' the nature of Ceremonies may, yet the uſe of them cannot be indifferent; becauſe the end of uſing them muſt be either good, evil, or impertinent, and our actions are ſpecified by their ends*. Which is as much as to ſay, that to uſe indifferent Ceremonies for a good end, is a good action; to uſe them for an evil end, is an evil action; and to uſe them for an impertinent end, is an impertinent action: All which things I freely grant; and tho' ſomething may be inferred thereout in favour of our Church; yet what they here ſerve for, except it be for amuſement and perplexity, I am not able to diſcover. Secondly, he tells us that *things indifferent can make nothing decent or orderly; ſeeing they have nothing of decency or order in them; for if they had, they would be really good, and not indifferent*. To which I anſwer that things indifferent, in their own nature, may yet contribute to the *decency* and *order* of a good action; not by any intrinſick goodneſs which is inherent in themſelves, but as they are *ſigns of the good intention* of the perſons who preſcribe and practiſe them in the performace of ſuch an action. Thus for Example, to bow the body, to kneel, to ſing, and that in a ſtinted metre are things in their nature indifferent: For neither are they any neceſſary part of the Law of Nature, nor do we find that they were ever commanded by God, until pious and good

men

men took up those customs of themselves in the Worship of God: And yet I believe our Author will not deny, but that these things may conduce to the more decent and orderly Performance of such Worship, where they are sincerely intended as outward marks of that inward Devotion and Reverence which men do truly pay to God. And why may not the same thing be said of any other lawful Ceremonies or Circumstances, which are sincerely intended and made use of to the very same purpose?

But thirdly, he comes in with a dilemma; *If*, says he, *these Ceremonies are necessary means of decency and order, then Christ and his Apostles, who used them not, baptized, prayed and communicated undecently. If not necessary, why is all this needless contention about them?* To the first part of which argument I Answer, that our Church never pretended that these particular Ceremonies were absolutely necessary to order and decency: But only (as things stood at the time of the Reformation) highly convenient to be retained; and, all things considered, not so convenient to be altered. But to the second I reply more distinctly; First, that to alter the whole frame of our Liturgy (as some would have it) would, in my apprehension, be a thing of very ill consequence, as well upon the account of those plausible pretences it would give the Church of *Rome* against us; (who would be sure to make their advantage of it) as of the scandal it would give to a multitude of our own weaker members, who either having heard the manner of our Worship so often decryed by the Non-conformists as Popish, Superstitious, and even Idolatrous; would be apt to think that all this acculation was true, if all the things which were so found fault with, should wholly be laid aside; or else perhaps would be much dissatisfied to have those things abolished, which to them do appear to be so orderly and decent, and such others substituted in the room thereof as would not be so well pleasing to them. But Secondly as for some Alterations and improvements which might, I think, be very well made in our constitutions; I am altogether of opinion that no sober and well meaning Man of our Church would be against them, if it did but any way appear that the Nonconformists, or any number of them, would thereby be won to our Communion. But while they seem to demand all, or else will be satisfied with nothing; it is feared by many that even such alterations as are but inconsiderable in themselves, would yet be of inconvenient consequence. But if our Governours should be granted to be to blame in insisting too stiffly upon things which are not necessary; Yet still I do not see how this can be pleaded as a just excuse for refusing that obedience to them, which the Law of the Land requires, and the law of God does not forbid. For there are cases where tho' it may be a fault in Legislators or Parents too strictly to command, yet still it would be the duty of the Subject or the Child to obey.

In

In the next paragraph he grants, *with me, that Worſhip cannot be performed without Circumſtances, and that all outward Circumſtances of Worſhip are not expreſsly preſcribed by God:* From whence it demonſtratively follows, that ſome Circumſtances of Worſhip may be uſed (and therefore why not by lawful authority appointed and determined) which God himſelf has not commanded. What then can juſtly be ſaid againſt our Ceremonies, which I have ſo evidently proved to be *Circumſtances* only, and not *parts of Worſhip?* Why this, ſays our Author here, that they *are myſtical Rites and Ceremonies*, and *not Circumſtances*, which things, in his opinion, are very different; *tho' craftily or ignorantly they be confounded.* Now whether it may be our Author's *craft* or *ignorance*, I know not; but this I am ſure of, that to lay ſuch a ſtreſs, as he does, upon hard words, without diſtinctly explaining their ſignification, is the way eternally to *confound*, and perplex all, and never to determine any Diſputes or Controverſies: And therefore if he would have avoided that Cenſure which here obliquely he caſts upon us, he ſhould have defined and carefully diſtinguiſhed thoſe things, which in his opinion, we *confound*; and have told us particularly what was to be underſtood by a *Myſtical Rite*; and wherein it differed from a *Circumſtance*. And what thoſe ſame myſteries are, which he ſuppoſes to be comprehended under any of our Ceremonies. And laſtly, whether all ſuch myſteries are abſolutely unlawful; or if not, for what reaſon ours are ſo: For my part I know no other myſticalneſs in any of our Ceremonies, ſave only that we uſe them as apt and proper marks of what we inwardly intend: We uncover our heads, and kneel on our knees in the Worſhip of God, for no other reaſon, but to denote that profound Reverence which we ought always to have for his Majeſty; and ſomething of the like nature we deſign in all the reſt of our Ceremonies: And if he will call this a *Myſtery*; yet I think he ought clearly to prove *the thing to be unlawful.* And not take it for a ſufficient confutation of us, that he has improperly applyed a hard word upon this occaſion, without any diſtinct explication of its meaning.

But *time, place, perſon, &c. which are Circumſtances of humane actions cannot*, ſays he, *be called Rites or Ceremonies.* I pray, why ſo? were not the *time* of the Jewiſh Sabbath, and other Feſtivals, the *place Jeruſalem*, and the Temple where they kept their Feaſts, and performed much of their Worſhip; And the *perſons* of the particular Tribe of *Levi*, who were immediately appointed to miniſter to God in their publick Service; were not the obſervation of all theſe, I ſay, parts of the Ceremonial Law of *Moſes*? And if they were, why may not the particular *time, place* and *perſons* appointed for the performance of an action, be called Ceremonies of it as well as the *poſture of Body* or the *garment* in which the ſame is to be done?

But if *Ceremony* and *Circumſtance* do thus in a manner ſignifie the ſame thing, *Ceremonies ſhould be neceſſary and not indifferent, ſeeing it is impoſſible to do any thing without Circumſtances!* I Anſwer, That tho' to do an action *without all Circumſtances* be impoſſible, yet *this or that particular Circumſtance* may be indifferent, and not neceſſary; becauſe it may be changed for another: And if we will be nice in diſtinguiſhing theſe words *Ceremony* and *Circumſtance*, one from the other; all the difference that I know between them is this, *viz.* That as every thing which is a concomitant of an action, is ordinarily called a *Circumſtance* of it; ſo thoſe Circumſtances, which by any Law or Cuſtom generally obſerved, are particularly determined and annexed to the performance of that action, are uſually termed the *Ceremonies* of it. And accordingly there may be Ceremonies of Divine, Civil, Eccleſiaſtical, or bare cuſtomary Determination and Appointment, as I have but now ſaid.

But if a Ceremony in Worſhip, which I affirm to be but a Circumſtance, be *not natural* and *neceſſary for a decent performance of the action*, nor *comprehended in any general Law of Chriſt*; it muſt be an *addition to his Inſtitutions, and contrary to that precept*, Deut. 12. 32. But here again is a great ſtreſs laid upon doubtful expreſſions, without ſo much as one word offered toward clearing the meaning, and removing the ambiguity of them. For neither has he told us what he means by theſe words, *Natural* and *Neceſſary*; which ſometimes are taken in a ſtrict Senſe, to denote ſuch things as are *abſolutely and indiſpenſably required*, or dictated by the meer inſtinct of Nature, and ſometimes, in a larger Senſe, to ſignifie ſuch things as are only very proper and convenient: Nor has he informed us what he intends by being *Comprehended in a General Law of Chriſt*: For a thing may be thus comprehended in a general Law, either *immediately* and *directly* (as every direct Act of Sin is comprehended under ſome general prohibition; and every poſitive and direct Act of Duty under ſome of the General Commands) or elſe more remotely and reductively, (as the *means of performing a Duty, or reſiſting a Temptation*, and alſo ſome of the moſt *Congruous and proper Circumſtances of Action*; which tho' variable in themſelves, according to the various caſes which fall out; yet according to the rules of Prudence and Congruity are often Reducible, tho' more remotely, and not ſo directly, to ſome of the general rules of Duty, becauſe from ſuch things as theſe the goodneſs of Actions may be enhanſed, or the evil aggravated). Nor laſtly has he fixed the ſignification of this Expreſſion, *viz.* *An Addition to Chriſt's Inſtitutions*: By which if he means the doing any thing more in the performance of a Duty, than what ſtrictly and exactly Chriſt has Commanded; Either he muſt prove that Chriſt has Commanded every *Punctilio* of what is preſcribed in the Directo-

ry,

ry, or elſe he muſt condemn that as well as the Liturgy, as *an Addition to Chriſt's Inſtitutions.* But if by this Expreſſion he means the enjoyning and enacting an uncommanded thing, as if God himſelf had immediately Commanded it; and ſo counterfeiting and ſtamping the Divine Authority, upon that which is no more but a humane Tradition, or Inſtitution (which to me ſeems the very utmoſt intent of that part of the Precept which he quotes *Deut.* 12. 32.) He cannot but know that no manner of guilt can be faſtned on our Church upon this account: Becauſe ſhe plainly and fully diſtinguiſhes between the *unalterable* Commands of God, and her own Eccleſiaſtical inſtitutions, which ſhe acknowledges to be *alterable*, and not of Eternal Obligation.

Towards the end of that Paragraph of my Addreſs which we are ſtill upon, I had deſired to know, *ſince Ceremonies might be uſed without Superſtition; how we could more effectually diſclaim Superſtition in the uſe of them, than we already do?* To which he returns me this anſwer, that *a more effectual way is to diſclaim all uſe of them:* Which is juſt as if he had ſaid, that the beſt way *to uſe Ceremonies* without Superſtition is *not to uſe them* at all; And if that be not a Contradiction, I know not what is. But here I muſt tell him that as there is no manner of Superſtition, either in preſcribing or practiſing a thing which God has left in it ſelf indifferent, as long as we retain and profeſs the true Opinion of its indifferency; ſo to diſclaim wholly the uſe of any thing, which in it ſelf is lawful, as if it were forbidden by God, when really it is not ſo; is in my apprehenſion a groſs piece of Superſtition: And therefore to diſclaim all uſe of Ceremonies is not ſo effectual a way to avoid Superſtition, as our Author would have us believe; but rather the quite contrary: For *to lay any Weight upon, and to be guided by, groundleſs imaginations of our own, in matters relating either to God's Providence or Religion is* what I take to be the proper and true notion of *Superſtition.* And as this Practiſe of diſclaiming all our Ceremonies in the Worſhip of God would Evidently be Superſtition; ſo the Principle upon which our Author preſſes, it is, as plainly as can be, no leſs than the *Addition of a Negative Precept to the Law of God.* For he tells us *that whatever is not Commanded by God, and is required by Men, as a means of the Worſhip of God, is forbidden by God;* Upon which he would have us lay all our Ceremonies aſide. But no ſuch Prohibition as this appears in the Law of God, either in expreſs words or by a fair and juſt conſequence, (as I have plainly ſhewn by examining all the places of Scripture alledged by him). I conclude therefore that this is an Addition of his own; And therefore let him ſee to it how he can avoid or excuſe the breaking of that Command which he Quotes, *Deut.* 12. 32.

The third main Propoſition, which I have ſuggeſted in my Addreſs, is a Corollary which muſt evidently follow from the two preceding ones; viz.

viz. If in the Communion of our Church there be neither any thing wanting which is neceſſary to Salvation (which was my firſt propoſition) *nor any thing preſcribed in it which is ſinful* (which was my ſecond Propoſition) then certainly *our Communion is at leaſt innocent*, and not unlawful: In which ſequel if the Premiſes hold good (as I think I have juſtified them againſt all our Authors Objections) the concluſion cannot be denied or doubted of. But becauſe mens Actions are generally regulated, not ſo much according to the *Reallity* of things, as according to their own *Judgment and Apprehenſion of them*; I proceeded to conſider whether it might be a juſt cauſe for men to refuſe communion with us upon either of theſe accounts; *viz. That they judged our Communion unlawful*; altho' *really and in it ſelf it were not ſo*; or elſe that they *doubted whether it were lawful or not*; and therefore thought it the beſt way not to joyn with us as long as this doubt remained unreſolved.

As to the former of theſe; *who judge our communion abſolutely unlawful*; I in my Addreſs refer them to what I had before ſaid; And tell them that except they can ſhew wherein the Sin of our Communion lies; their *Judgment* muſt needs be *falſe and uncharitable*: And as our Author deſires that what he has ſaid upon this Subject may be *conſidered*, ſo I entreat the Reader likewiſe to *conſider* the Anſwers which I have now returned to every material thing which he has urged.

As to the other ſort, who do not abſolutely judge our Communion unlawful, but *only doubt*, or *are not well aſſured* concerning the lawfulneſs of it; I propoſe to them the common rule which is given in doubtful caſes; *viz.* That they ſhould *chooſe that way which is moſt ſafe and free from the danger of Sin.* But *how*, ſays our Author *ſhall a Perſon who is not able to clear his doubts, about which is the moſt ſafe way, yet chooſe the moſt ſafe way?* I anſwer that ſuch a Perſon indeed, while the doubt is equal on both ſides, has no certain rule to chooſe by. But if the doubt on the one ſide be very ſtrong, and founded upon the plain principles of Scripture or reaſon; and that on the other ſide, upon a ſtrict Examination, appears to be no more but a *ſcruple* or groundleſs fear ariſing from fancy or prejudice, and not from any clear and rational Judgment of things; in ſuch a caſe as this, altho' ſome ſort of doubt may yet remain concerning the lawfulneſs of the Action; yet may it plainly appear which is the ſafeſt way, and leſt liable to the danger of Sin. For tho' I allow with *Cicero*, whom our Author quotes as agreeing with St. *Paul*, that a Man ought not to do any thing, concerning the lawfulneſs of which he retains a *real doubt*; yet ſtill I will venture to affirm with Dr. *Ames* De Conſc. L. 1. C. 6. That *many ſcruples there are which, if they cannot be removed by reaſons given to the contrary, ought, by a ſort of force, to be laid aſide, and not to be conſulted with.* And I preſume our Author will allow *this Doctor* to be as good a Caſuiſt as the *Pagan Cicero*; Altho' he is pleaſed to acquaint the World that I do not deſerve the honour to be thought ſo.

In

In Order then to find out which is the safeſt way, for ſuch doubting Perſons to take, and to ſhew that the ſcruples, from whence ſuch doubtfulneſs ariſes in them, are groundleſs. I very briefly, yet I think plainly, urged theſe following things, *viz.* That *no man ought to deviate from a plain and evident Law of God on account of ſuch Suggeſtions as he owns to be but obſcure and doubtful:* That *to promote the Peace and Unity of the Church, and to give Obedience to the Commands of Lawful Authority, are very plainly and evidently commanded by God*: That *in this preſent caſe, the Suggeſtions, upon which ſuch a doubting Perſon refrains from our Communion, are ſuppoſed to be but doubtful and obſcure.* (For if they were clear and plain, it would alter the Caſe; and the Perſon of whom we are ſpeaking would no longer remain in doubt; but be abſolutely determined in his Judgment) And laſtly, *that a doubt in Point of Conſcience which, after a reaſonable time for enquiry, never comes to any poſitive Determination, is more probably the effect of fancy or prejudice than of any Sober and impartial Reaſoning; And therefore ought not to be put into the Ballance againſt ſuch plain Commands of God; as do not admit of any doubt at all.* Now he that has as little *Reaſon and Divinity*, as our Author will allow me to have, may yet ſee, that he gives a very illogical Anſwer to theſe things, which I have thus offered. For without the leſt offer made to confute my premiſes, or ſhew they are unconcluſive, he falls directly foul upon the concluſion it ſelf; and repeats the ſame Objection which I had before made; *viz.* That *to conform doubtingly either for Peace, or in Obedience to the Magiſtrate, is Sinful Conformity*: For *he that doubteth is damned, if he eat, and whatſoever is not of Faith, is Sin*, p. 105. To which I Anſwer, that a doubt concerning the lawfulneſs of Obedience, to any humane Command is a very juſt reaſon for a man to *ſuſpend acting*, until ſuch time as he has made enquiry into the matter: But if after all he can find no ſolid and rational Foundation for this doubt; he ought to look upon it as no more but a meer *Scruple*, and to deal with it according to the direction which I have juſt now quoted out of Dr. *Ames*: For if we muſt forever forbear Acting, upon account of ſuch ſort of doubts as theſe; the conſequence will be almoſt perpetual perplexity of Conſcience, to all thoſe who are not able clearly and diſtinctly to Solve all the little Scruples, which either the Devil or their own weak fancies, may at any time raiſe in their minds; which would render Religion unto ſuch Perſons, as a yoke impoſſible to be born.

And here by the way, I deſire the Reader to take Notice, how dexterouſly our Author perverts my words, only by the omiſſion of one Syllable in his recital of them. In that part of my Addreſs now under Conſideration, I have theſe words; *If after a reaſonable time for enquiry, he is not able to determine this doubt, ſo as poſitively to ſatisfie himſelf upon ſolid grounds, that ſuch Conformity is* unlawful; *what reaſon can be given, why ſuch a doubt ſhould be put*

in the Ballance; *againſt thoſe plain Commands of God which I have mention'd.* Now in the recital of theſe words of mine, our Author inſtead of the word *unlawful*, puts the word *lawful*, p. 105. So that whereas my Argument in effect, runs thus, *viz. Becauſe a Man is no way convinc'd that ſuch a thing is* unlawful, *therefore he ought to do it, if lawful Authority commands it*, (which I take to be very Reaſonable,) Our Author would inſinuate to the World, as if I had meant that, *becauſe a Man is not convinc'd that ſuch a thing is* lawful; *therefore he ought to do it if Authority requires it:* which is altogether abſurd and void of Conſequence.

But *why*, ſay I, *is it not as much a Sin doubtingly to refuſe Conformity, as doubtingly to conform?* To this Queſtion, he returns me, pag. 106, back to S. *Paul* for an Anſwer; who ſays, that *he that doubteth is Damned if he eat*; But does not ſay, that *he who doubteth is Damned, if he refuſe to eat.* But I find that a *little more Reaſon and Divinity*, would do our Author no more hurt than it would me; which if he had, it *would have taught him*, that in the Caſe propoſed by S. *Paul*, the doubt could only be upon one ſide of the Queſtion, becauſe there was no Law, either of God or Man, which Commanded them to eat the things there ſpoken of; and therefore there could be no ſuſpicion of Sin, in refuſing to eat them: For, *where there is no Law, there is no Tranſgreſſion.* But in our Caſe there are two plain Laws, *viz. That of Peace and Union in the Church, and that of Obedience unto the higher Powers*; both of them enacted by God, and both of them requiring our Conformity to the Eſtabliſhed Worſhip, except we can aſſign ſomething therein, which is unlawful: And therefore here the doubt muſt be as well on this ſide of the Queſtion as the other; And why a man's doubts in ſuch a Caſe as this, ſhould determine him to Diſobedience, and not rather to Obedience; (the later being *plainly* and *expreſsly* required, and the former being only grounded upon ſome dark and obſcure ſuggeſtions) is what I believe all our Authors *Reaſon and Divinity*, will not be able plainly and clearly to account for.

But our Author will not allow *thoſe who ſo halt between two Opinions, as neither to follow God nor* Baal, to be *Nonconformiſts, or of his Party any more than of ours!* The plain Engliſh of which ſeems to be, that *to be a Nonconformiſt, is to follow God*; But, *to be of the Eſtabliſhed Church is a following of* Baal. And if ſuch little ſcruples and doubts as may ariſe, upon what he has above inſinuated concerning *Nadab* and *Abihu*, *&c.* do keep a Man fixed in Nonconformity, it ſhall be well approved of: But if the Peace and Unity of the Church, and Obedience to the Law of the Land, ſhall have ſo much influence upon him, as to put him! but in *ſuſpenſe* concerning what is beſt to be done; Away with him, he halts between God and *Baal*; And ſince *he gathereth not with* our Author, he is to be rejected as one that *ſcattereth.* But I muſt re-

turn

turn to the preceding Paragraph, in which, as I ſaid, he endeavours to run down my Concluſion, without ſo much as offering to refute my Premiſſes.

And here he goes on, and tells me, that *a little more Reaſon and Divinity, would have taught me that Negative Precepts bind ad ſemper, But poſitive precepts bind only Semper.* I Anſwer, that I have indeed met with this in my ſmall reading in *Divinity*; but how to apply it to his Purpoſe, my *Reaſon* does not inſtruct me. And therefore ſince he was ſo ſenſible of my defects herein, he ſhould have informed, and not amuſed me. All that I urge is, that the *poſitive precepts*, of the Churches Unity, and Obedience to the Laws, may be allowed to oblige us ſo far, as not to Act contrary to them without a real neceſſity: And that a *Negative precept*, of not acting with a doubting mind, may not be ſo far extended beyond its due intent and meaning, as that little and groundleſs ſcruples ſhould be allowed, to out-ballance the plain and evident commands of God: And how our Authors *School Notions* do any way contradict this reaſonable offer, I proteſt I cannot find out. He tells me, 2. That *a Rule againſt which there is no Exception, will over-ballance that which is limited by Exceptions.* But if the former of theſe Rules which concerns a doubting mind, preſſes with equal force upon both the Scales; and makes as much againſt *refuſing Conformity*, as againſt *Conforming*, (as I have ſhewn it does) then I hope the latter Rule, which enjoyns Peace Unity, and Obedience to Authority, and inclines to one ſide only, ought in all Reaſon to *turn the Ballance.* But 3. he tells me, that *if my Epiſcopal brethren in* Scotland, *ſhould doubt of the lawfulneſs of ſubmitting to Preſbytery, now by Law Eſtabliſhed there; by my Rule they are bound to Conform for Peace, and in Obedience to Authority, and why don't I preach this to them.* To which I anſwer that a bare doubt, which never comes to a poſitive determination on the one ſide or other, (and therefore, in my Opinion, muſt proceed from fancy or prejudice only, and not from ſound Reaſon) ought not, I think, to be put in the Ballance againſt the Commands of lawful Authority: But to apply this general Rule, to the Conſtitutions of any other Church, except our own, I conceive to be none of my buſineſs. But if our Author has a mind, to have my Doctrine Propagated in *Scotland*; he may if he pleaſes ſend my Addreſs into that Kingdom. But, ſays he, by this Rule *if a Man in* France *or* Spain, *ſhould be in doubt whether Popery, or Proteſtantiſm were the ſafeſt, he ought to be a Papiſt in Obedience to Authority.* I anſwer, that the conſequence will not hold: For altho' it may be a Mans duty to obey, ſuch Commands of Authority, *as are in themſelves lawful*, notwithſtanding ſome doubts or ſcruples which he has to the contrary; yet will it not follow from hence, that therefore he is equally obliged to obey ſuch Commands, *as are in themſelves unlawful*; which is what he would faſten upon me: But how far even in this Caſe, a man may be obliged to follow the dictates of a Conſcience; which

which is but imperfectly informed is none of my buſineſs here to enquire.

Our Author tells us, that *we may not follow Peace or obey Superiors, except in Faith; And therefore to conform doubtingly is a Sin.* From whence I may certainly, *à Fortiori*, infer, that therefore we ought not *to break Peace*, or *diſobey Superiors*, except in Faith; and therefore, *doubtingly to refuſe Conformity, will be a greater Sin*; which is what I offered in my Addreſs. He tells us alſo that *our Obedience to Superiors, is limited by lawfulneſs, poſſibility, expedience, and edification.* Now that no Authority can lay an obligation upon any Man, to do a thing, which is either *unlawful* or *impoſſible*, is very certain: But where the thing Commanded, is both lawful and poſſible; for a Subject to refuſe Obedience, becauſe it is not *Expedient*; or does not tend to *Edification*; is what I cannot ſo readily approve of, except I have ſome better Argument for it than our Author's bare Aſſertion. And I would fain be informed by him, who in this Caſe, is to be judge of the *expediency* and *edification* of the thing commanded? If the Superiors; then ſince our Legiſlators have judged our Conſtitutions, to be expedient and edifying, no Argument can be drawn from hence, againſt our Conformity to them. But if every Subject muſt herein be a Judge for himſelf; ſince the Expediency and Edification of things, cannot always be brought under certain and fixed Rules, but are many times very variable in divers Caſes, and different circumſtances; And ſince the Apprehenſions alſo of different Men, are herein very various, according to their divers Fancies, Prejudices or Inclinations; What is this but to ſet up, not only the *Conſcience*, but even the fickle Imagination of every private Man to control Authority, whenſoever the Humour ſhall take him, or any crafty Man, who would gain him to his Party, ſhall impoſe upon him? Which is much more eaſy to do, in relation to the *Expediency* or *Edification* of a thing, than the lawfulneſs or poſſibility of it.

Having diſpatch'd the Objection againſt our Communion, which is drawn from the doubts and ſcruples, which ſome men have entertain'd, concerning the lawfulneſs of it; I proceed in the next place in my Addreſs, to propoſe and anſwer that which is taken from the pretence of *Chriſtian Liberty*: And becauſe our Author ſeems to have taken more than ordinary care to perplex this part of the Diſpute; I muſt crave the Readers patience, while I take a little pains fairly to open and clear it.

As God Almighty had by *Moſes* given a *Written Law* unto the Children of *Iſrael*; ſo, in proceſs of time, the Scribes and Phariſees had not only introduced divers *Traditions* of their own, (ſome of which might poſſibly in themſelves have been innocent, tho' unneceſſary) but alſo required the obſervation of theſe Traditions, not only as immediate parts of the Law of God; but alſo, in ſome caſes, to be preferred even before the precepts of the

the written Law, whenever they ſhould come in competition one with the other; of which we have a pretty full account in the former part of the 7th Chapter of St. *Mark*'s Goſpel. Now when many of the Jews began to receive the Chriſtian Faith; ſome there were who either out of a ſecret deſign to obſtruct the progreſs of the Goſpel, or a profound veneration for that Inſtitution, under which they had been brought up; taught this Doctrine in the Chriſtian Church, *viz.* that *Circumciſion* and the *Obſervation of the Law* of *Moſes*, were abſolutely *neceſſary to Salvation*, notwithſtanding that Chriſt was come into the World, as we are informed, *Acts* 15. 1. 24. And as they had generally received the above mention'd *Traditions* with an equal, and in ſome caſes a greater reſpect than what they had for the *written Law*; ſo did they no leſs endeavour to obtrude the one than the other upon all thoſe who had, or ſhould Embrace Chriſtianity. And notwithſtanding that the *Apoſtles and Elders* upon the firſt broaching of this Doctrine, endeavoured to ſuppreſs and put a ſtop to it, *Act.* 15. 6, *&c.* yet, for all this, we find that it took root and prevailed, more or leſs, in divers of the Chriſtian Churches.

To eaſe the Conſciences therefore of all the Faithful from ſuch an unneceſſary and unſupportable burden, and alſo to free Chriſtianity from ſuch a clog as muſt needs very much retard the progreſs of it; the Apoſtles of Chriſt, wherever there was occaſion, took conſtant care to inform all who had received the Faith; of that freedom which Chriſt had given them from the Ordinances of the Moſaick Law, as well as from all other uncertain Traditions, which ſome men, without any other Authority but their own groundleſs fancies, would impoſe upon them; and alſo to exhort them to maintain, and by no means betray that liberty which was thus vouchſafed unto them: Of which I need not ſtand to produce any Inſtances, becauſe the thing is not only confeſt on all hands, but alſo moſt notorious to all who do but read the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*, and particularly thoſe to the *Galatians* and *Coloſſians*.

Thus far then the Scripture does, undoubtedly, require every Chriſtian to aſſert and ſtand faſt in his liberty; *viz. Not to admit or own any thing as an eſſential part of Religion, and therefore neceſſary to Salvation, which God has not directly required and preſcribed as ſuch.* For which, the Reaſon I have given in my *Addreſs*, is unanſwerable; namely, that *it may be given to ſuch ſort of impoſitions, ſo many things, through pride or ignorance, may be introduced into Chriſtianity, as to make it a yoke too heavy to be born.*

Two things then I think there are, which, if fairly ſtated and cleared, muſt, one way or other, put an end to the difference between our Author and me, concerning this point: Namely, firſt, whether the obligation which lies upon us to maintain our *Chriſtian Liberty*, ought to be extended

any farther than those bounds which I have now set to it? And if not, then secondly, whether this obligation (even as I have stated it) can, either by the letter of Scripture, or parity of Reason, be justly so construed as to restrain any man from yielding Conformity to any of the Constitutions of the Established Church? upon which two things I desire the Reader still to have an eye, whilst I am examining what our Author has said, which may relate to either of them: For I cannot so well handle them each a-part, because I am confined to follow that path in which he has thought fit to lead me.

He tells me then, *pag.* 107. that I *have not faithfully framed the Non-Conformists Objection*; For their Notion, it seems, of Christian Liberty, and the obligation to maintain it, is somewhat different from mine; and if *things in their own nature indifferent* are *imposed* (tho not as essential parts of Religion, or necessary to Salvation) but only *as parts or means of Worship, or Conditions of Communion in it*; this, according to him, is an *infringement* of that Christian *Liberty, in which we are bound to stand fast.* To which I answer, First, That since the Worship of God is *an essential part of Religion*; to impose any thing *as a part of Worship*, would be to impose it as an *essential part of Religion:* For (as he has thought it necessary to inform me, p. 102.) *quod est pars partis est pars totius.* As therefore he has, thus far, said no more than what I had said before him; so have I already shewn that those indifferent things, which by our Liturgy are required in the service of God, are not imposed *as parts of Worship*; and therefore there ought on this account to be no Controversie about them. Secondly, To submit to such indifferent things as are imposed *expressly not as parts of Worship*, but only as the *means*, way or manner of performing it (provided that such imposing proceed from *Lawful Authority*) I have already shewn not to be unlawful, and have answered all our Author's pretences to the contrary: Nor can I upon his assertion believe that such a submission for peace and unities sake, is any way a giving up of our Christian Liberty, until I see some good proof for it, either expressly contained in, or evidently consequent from God's Words; of which I believe he would not have been so sparing, if the Bible would have afforded him any Texts, upon which to have grounded an Argument. Or *if our Liturgy be*, on this account, *an infringement of Christian Liberty, not only all other Churches are guilty of the same, but even the Directory* it self, *which imposes some things in themselves indifferent, cannot be excused from it.* Which passage of my Address he has thought fit to slip over, with a very lame and imperfect Answer. Thirdly, To impose any indifferent things *as Conditions of Communion*, if it were done either with an express declaration, or any evident implication or supposition, that no Communion could lawfully be kept up in, or held with, any Church whatsoever, without the use of those things which were so imposed; this indeed would

be to impose such things as *essential and necessary parts of Worship and Religion*; and consequently, on the imposers part, an unlawful attempt upon Christian Liberty. But as I have shewn that this is none of our Churches case; who expresly owns such her Constitutions to be alterable as just cause shall require; and neither rejects the Communion, nor condemns the Practice of any other Church which differs from her in such things as these: So if the matter were even thus it self; yet if any private Christian should, for Peace and Unity, so far comply with the Church, as to submit to what she had required, and practise what she had thus Prescribed; but yet with an Express Declaration and open Protestation, that he did this not out of any necessity, which was supposed to be in the things themselves, which he still asserted to be in their own Nature indifferent; but only for peace sake, and, as far as in him lay, to prevent all Schisms or Divisions; I cannot see how such a Man as this could be condemned, as therein guilty of any Sin, or any way a betrayer of his *Christian Liberty*. And if in this my Opinion, I am perhaps mistaken, I shall be very glad to be better informed; provided it be done with *Clear* and *Solid* Arguments from plain Scripture and Reason, and not with such *perplexed* and *trifling* Suggestions, as we have hitherto met with from our Author. But Fourthly, Since (as our Author grants, p. 103) *without Circumstances, Worship cannot be performed, and all outward Circumstances of Worship are not prescribed by God.* It must follow, either that some outward Circumstances of Worship may be determined and appointed by Man, or else the Worship of God cannot possibly be performed. Suppose then that the Church appoints and determines some indifferent things, as Circumstances in Gods Worship; and requires them to be observed by all her Members; And yet that some are so Obstinate and Refractory, as that they will not submit to her Authority in these things: What is to be done in such a Case as this? must every particular Man be left to his liberty, to introduce what Circumstances he pleases into the Worship of God, according to his own Fancy or Inclination? This would be the direct way to confound that *Order*, and destroy that *Decency*, for which the Apostle particularly provides, 1 *Cor.* 14. 40, as I have said in my Address; And to exclude the *Directory* as well as the *Liturgy*. Or must the Church from time to time, alter and new model her Constitutions, concerning the Circumstances of Gods Worship until matters are so setled, as that every one may be pleased and fully satisfied? This I confess were a most excellent way, if the thing were at all practicable or possible to be performed: But when it is considered that in such matters as relate to Order and Decency only, we have not always a fixed and certain Rule, as to particulars; but Men have different Opinions of such things, according to the difference of their Customs, Tempers, and Educations; I believe it will be found a very hard,

and

and perhaps an impossible thing, so to frame all the Circumstances of Divine Worship, as that all sorts of Men, how different soever in their Temper or Education, shall be well pleased and satisfied with them. And if this be not to be done; then, it may be, if any Church should go about to make alterations in such things, to please and gratifie some People; they might hereby displease and disgust many others; and so in the end do more hurt than good by such Alterations. What then remains? but that every Church in such things as these must act according to the best of her prudence; And if men will still be refractory and not submit to such Constitutions as lawful Authority enjoins, and are no way contrary to the Law or Word of God; I would gladly know what other course is at last to be taken with them, but to exclude them from the Communion of the Society, who thus obstinately refuse to conform to the Rules and Orders of it? And if our Author judges this to be an *infringement of Christian Liberty*, I desire he would not only say it, but also clearly and solidly prove it.

But *Christ has freed us from all parts and parcels of Worship which are not of his own Institution!* He has so: But what is this to those Ceremonies which I have plainly proved to be no *parts* (or *parcels*) but only *Circumstances* of Worship? *He has freed us also from all Conditions of Communion but those of his own Prescribing*! very right: But then we must remember that one Condition of Communion which Christ prescribes unto us, is to *obey them that have the rule over us, and submit our selves*, Heb. 13. 17. To *be subject to the higher powers*, Rom. 13. 1. And to *submit our selves to every ordinance of man for the Lords sake*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 13. And whosoever *obstinately refuses* to perform this condition, is justly to be excluded from the Communion of the Church, as a disobeyer of Christ's Commands. Now the Question is, Wherein and in what sort of things is this obedience and subjection to be shewn? Not in things immediately or directly commanded by the Law of God: For in such things as those our obedience is paid to God alone, and not to our Earthly Superiours; And the obligation is the same, if my *Inferiour* informs me that such is the Will of God, as if my Superiour lays his commands therein upon me. Nor yet in such things as are contrary to God's Law: For if our Superiours should command any thing of that nature, *we ought to obey God rather than man*, *Acts* 5. 29. It remains then, that *things in their own nature indifferent, when required by lawful Authority, are the proper and adequate matter wherein our obedience to our Superiours, whether Ecclesiastical or Civil, is to be shewn.* And as all Superiours ought to exercise their power of commanding with Prudence and Charity, as they shall answer for the same before the Throne of God; so are all inferiours most evidently obliged in Conscience to be conformable and obedient to such commands, when the matter thereof

is lawful in it ſelf: nor is ſuch conformity any way inconſiſtent with our *Chriſtian Liberty.*

But *Chriſt*, ſays he, *hath allowed us the uſe of indifferent things indifferently, as Chriſtian Prudence and Charity ſhall determine!* I grant it. But then I would know why the *uſe* of ſuch things may not, in ſome caſes, as well be *determined by the Chriſtian Prudence and Charity of the Church* for the whole Society, as in other caſes by thoſe of every private man for himſelf? Except it be that ſome men have a very ſtrong inclination to be guided by their own fancies, rather than by the will of their Superiors. But this, ſays he, would be *ſo to determine our practice, as to deſtroy its indifferency!* I Anſwer, that this indeed would make it the duty of every private man to conform his practice in ſuch indifferent things, to the Law that is over him, as long as that Law remains in force (in which I ſee not the leaſt inconvenience or abſurdity): but would not ſo far deſtroy the indifferency either of the thing, or our practice; but that, upon the repeal of that Law which bound us, we ſhould be as much at liberty as ever we were. But our Author tells us, that *the main violation of Chriſtian Liberty lies in a fixt, ſtated and perpetual compulſion, to do what God hath permitted us to omit; or a prohibition to do what he hath made lawful for us.* I Anſwer; if, 1. The ſubject matter of this *Compulſion* or *Prohibition* be in its own nature lawful or indifferent; If, 2. The *Compulſion* or *Prohibition* proceed from lawful Authority; And if, 3. It be by that Authority ſufficiently declared, that this ſame *Compulſion* or *Prohibition* is not to be eſteemed as an expreſs or immediate part of Gods Law; but only as a humane conſtitution, to which, while it remains in force (and no longer) we are in Conſcience obliged to give obedience, on account of the general Commands of God, which require us to be ſubject to our lawful Governours: Such a *Compulſion* or *Prohibition* as this, is no manner of *violation of Chriſtian Liberty.*

But he will prove that it is, and that by the Authority of St. *Paul*; For *thus*, ſays he, *the Apoſtle teacheth*, 1 Cor. 6. 12. *All things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any perſon or thing in matters indifferent.* But, I ſay, the Apoſtle does not thus teach: And it is not only a moſt diſingenuous, but even an impious preſumption in this bold man thus to falſifie the Text of St. *Paul*, and *to add unto the Word of God*, whatever his deſign therein may be. The words of St. *Paul* in the place quoted, are neither more nor leſs than theſe, *All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient: All things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any.* Where it is evident from the following verſe, that he ſpeaks only concerning the eating or forbearing of ſuch *Meats* as ſome indeed ſcrupled out of weakneſs; but which were not *commanded* or *enjoined* by any Law or Conſtitution either of God or Man. And our Author could

not but ſee that it was impoſſible ſo far to extend St. *Paul*'s own words, as to bring them in the leaſt to countenance Diſobedience to lawful Authority; and therefore that he muſt either add to them, or elſe not be able to produce ſo much as one Text of Scripture to prove that which with ſo much aſſurance he had aſſerted. But if he has a power given him to make Scripture where he has it not ready to ſerve his purpoſe, I muſt confeſs it will be hard to diſpute with him. Nor can he here pretend that he ſets down the laſt words of the above mentioned quotation, not as a part of St. *Paul*'s Text, but only as his own Paraphraſe upon it: For (beſides that in the Apoſtles own words, there is no manner of foundation for the inſerting of the word *perſon*) the whole Sentence, as I have above recited it, is all a-like printed in the Italick Character, and all of it equally referred to thoſe foregoing words [*thus the Apoſtle teacheth*]: which I think moſt plainly ſhews that it was our Author's deſign, that the whole Sentence ſhould paſs upon his unwary Readers, as if it were every Syllable taken out of the place from whence he has quoted it.

But I ought not thus *to bind up my ſelf from opportunity of uſing my Chriſtian Liberty for the Spiritual good of another!* I Anſwer that, where a humane Law is made concerning any thing which otherwiſe were indifferent; Obedience *ordinarily* and *generally* ought to be given to that Law; Nor ought any man to ſwerve from it to gratifie the humour of ſuch as only reſolve to be perverſe and obſtinate. But where a caſe ariſes to which the intention of the law-makers either did not or ought not to have extended, and where by acting otherwiſe than the Law preſcribes, ſome great good may be done, or evil avoided or remedied; if all even ſeeming *contempt of Authority* be meekly and prudently avoided, and juſt occaſion of ſcandal carefully prevented and obviated; I, for my part, ſhould no way condemn that man, who upon ſuch an emergency, in ſuch a manner, and with ſuch caution as this, ſhould act otherwiſe than the letter of the humane Law ſhould preſcribe. In which opinion the generality of Learned Caſuiſts that I have happened to look into, do unanimouſly concur with me. And therefore what preſently follows, is ſpoken without any other ground but his own fancy, *viz.* that *by ſuch impoſing and determining in matters indifferent, more is attributed to the poſitive precepts of Men, than to the moral Laws of God.* For I challenge our Author to produce me *but one man* of any repute of the Eſtabliſhed Church, who ever maintained that *obedience* to our Eccleſiaſtical, or to any humane Laws, may not *pro hic & nunc be ſuſpended to give way to a greater good*, as well as *obedience to the poſitive moral Laws of God.* And as for *making that a ſin which God has made lawful* by not forbidding it, which is another of his objections, I have already anſwered it: And it is enough to ſay, that God has not made it lawful to diſobey lawful Authority in ſuch things as are indifferent.

From

From what I have hitherto been discourſing upon this ſubject, I think it may clearly be gathered, that notwithſtanding all that our Author has ſaid to the contrary, the obligation of maintaining our Chriſtian Liberty is no farther to be extended than as I had ſet the bounds and limits of it. But what follows in the next Paragraph, is deſigned to ſhew, that allowing my notion of *Chriſtian Liberty* to be juſt and good, yet ſtill our Ceremonies are *deſtructive* of it, becauſe they *are made eſſential parts of Religion, and neceſſary to Salvation*; which if he can but prove as clearly as he has confidently affirmed it, then indeed, and not otherwiſe, he might have reaſon to ſay that *my Anſwer is not ſufficient to the Objection, even as I my ſelf had framed it.*

Now here I muſt deſire the Reader to take notice what a poor and diſingenuous piece of Sophiſtry our Author endeavours to put upon the world. To convince the *Non-Conformiſts* that our Ceremonies were no infringement of Chriſtian Liberty, I gave them to underſtand, in my Addreſs, that our Church did not impoſe them *as eſſential parts of Religion, and neceſſary to Salvation*: In oppoſition to which, he undertakes to prove that they *are by us made eſſential parts of Religion, and neceſſary to Salvation*; and therefore *deſtructive of Chriſtian Liberty*: But when he comes to produce his Arguments, he cunningly conceals the main and fundamental part of the concluſion which he was to prove; and as for the other part of it, which was but an appendage to, or ſuperſtructure upon the former, he perverts and plainly alters the ſenſe and meaning of it.

The fundamental part of the concluſion which he undertakes to prove, is, that *our Ceremonies are by us made eſſential parts of Religion.* But in order to make this good, he does not ſo much as offer the leaſt word or ſyllable. The other part is, that *we make them neceſſary to Salvation*: which indeed he attempts to prove; but in a clear different ſenſe from that in which I denied it. My meaning was plainly this, that our Church did not pretend that her Ceremonies *were immediately derived from the eſſence of Religion*, or upon that account neceſſary to be obſerved; which I grant would be an encroachment upon Chriſtian Liberty: But all that his Arguments can pretend to prove, is, that our Ceremonies, being impoſed by the Laws of the Church, the uſe of them is eſteemed neceſſary to Salvation; not as being eſſential parts of Religion, or ſo reputed by us, but only as they are the matter wherein we ought to ſhew our conformity and obedience to the commands of lawful Authority. In Anſwer therefore to all his Arguments at once, I ſhall only tell him, that obedience to the lawful commands of lawful Authority, is one of thoſe Duties which God has made neceſſary to Salvation: And as far as any Ceremony is the matter of ſuch obedience, ſo far it is, by conſequence, in its proper degree, alſo neceſſary, altho' it be no eſſential part of Religion: Nor is there any thing

herein

herein which is any way deſtructiue of *Chriſtian Liberty*. But that which he ſhould have proved, was, that we eſteem our Ceremonies to be neceſſary to Salvation, even antecedently to the commands of the Church and the Law.

That therefore our Author's Arguments, which he here urges, are all of them wide from the point in Controverſie, is as evident as may be: But becauſe in ſome of them he has a ſly deſign, not ſo much to prove what he had juſt before undertaken, as to render the Eſtabliſhed Church as black and odious as may be in the eyes of his Party; It will be neceſſary before I proceed, to wipe off that dirt which here he rakes together to throw at her.

In the firſt place then, I muſt tell him, that what I have hitherto read of his Book, has not begot in me ſuch an opinion of his veracity, as, upon his bare word, to make me give credit to what he ſuppoſes, *viz.* that *the bare omiſſion of Ceremonies, tho' out of tenderneſs of Conſcience, is by us judged Schiſm, Sedition, and Rebellion*; *and made worthy of Fining, Impriſonment, and Excommunication*: Nor have I any reaſon to think his good nature towards us to be ſo abundant, as that he would have omitted to quote ſome paſſages of our Laws or Canons, if any ſuch there had been, to make good this charge to the utmoſt, which he thus aggravates againſt us. That Conſciences which are *truly tender*, ought ever to be uſed with the greateſt gentleneſs, is the unanimous opinion of all ſober and good men that ever I remember to have met with, either of our own or any other of the Reformed Churches: And altho' in the Letter of Humane Laws, an exception or diſpenſation for tender Conſciences is no way proper to be expreſsly inſerted; becauſe every man being able to make this pretence, and none but God, who knows the hearts of men, being able to confute it, where it is falſely, but craftily made; this would be the way wholly to enervate the ſanction and force of all ſuch Laws, and ſo to leave it at every mans pleaſure, whether he would obſerve them or not: yet in the execution of them (at leaſt of all ſuch as concern Religion and the Worſhip of God), I freely grant, that a due regard ought to be had to the invincible miſtakes of all ſuch as appear to be well-meaning men; becauſe it ought ever to be preſumed, that the intention of the Law-makers was not, or ought not to have been, that ſuch ſort of men as they ſhould be ſeverely dealt with. And if any particular men have ever preſt the Execution of our Eccleſiaſtical Laws beyond this; Let them anſwer for themſelves; for I am ſure I ſhall never appear in their defence. But where there are moſt ſtrong preſumptions that it is not real tenderneſs of Conſcience, but ſome other principle, which prompts a man not only himſelf to refuſe obedience to lawful Authority, but alſo to perſwade as many as he can to join with him therein; Where a man can without remorſe or ſcuple break ſome of the moſt known Laws of God; can con-

conſidently vent ſuch ſlanders and calumnies, as are not only contrary to charity, but alſo to truth it ſelf; and can pervert and miſquote, not only the Writings of a Man, but even the Word of God; and yet all this while ſhall refuſe to obey ſuch commands of Authority, as he cannot ſhew to be either expreſsly or by good conſequence contrary to any Law or Command of God; (which I have plainly ſhewn to be our Authors caſe). If ſuch a Man as this ſhall yet plead the *tenderneſs of his Conſcience*, for refuſing conformity to the Laws of the Land, (which yet it ſeems is *tough* enough to diſpenſe with the violation of the above mentioned Laws of God) I would gladly know whether ſuch a plea, and in ſuch a caſe, is to be admitted: And if the penalty of the Law be not put in execution againſt a man who plainly appears to be of this temper, I think he has more reaſon to thank the mildneſs of the Government, than to attribute it to any juſtice which he may pretend to be on his ſide, or favour that ought to be extended to him, on account of the tenderneſs of his Conſcience. But let a mans Conſciences be diſpoſed as it will; *the bare omiſſion of Ceremonies* is not by any of our Laws ſo ſeverely cenſured as our Author pretends; but was ſo wiſe as not to produce his proofs; nor is any man thereby condemned of *Schiſm*, except he makes or keeps up a ſeparation in the Church; nor of *Sedition* or *Rebellion*, except he helps to maintain a faction, or takes up arms againſt the Civil State; nor, laſtly, made ſubject to *Fining*, *Impriſonment* or *Excommunication*, except it be for *publick Oppoſition to the Eſtabliſhed Laws*. And if our Author had not conſulted more with paſſion or ill nature, than with ſober reaſon or charity, he would never have ſo ſtrained things beyond their due pitch, as he has moſt evidently done in the above mentioned ſuggeſtion, which he brings in charge againſt us.

Nor, Secondly, do I any where find it to be the Judgment of our Church, that every one who comes under the ſentence of Excommunication, muſt neceſſarily be ſuppoſed to *be delivered to Satan*; which is another of his good natured inſinuations. That thoſe Perſons, who, by publick diſobedience and oppoſition to the lawful commands of lawful Authority, do *cauſe diviſions and offences* in the Church, ſhould be *avoided*, and excluded from her viſible Communion, is no more than what I think to be ſufficiently warranted by the Apoſtle St. *Paul*, *Rom.* 16. 17. But becauſe it is poſſible, and ſometimes probable enough, that many men are thus miſled, not ſo much by wilfulneſs or obſtinacy, as by ſome great miſtakes or ſtrong prejudices which they have entertained, or, it may be, by a real *zeal of God, but not according to knowledge*; we are ſo far from concluding any of them to be abſolutely given into the poſſeſſion of the Devil, that, on the contrary, we charitably hope that the generality of them will *obtain mercy* at the hand of God; not do we at all doubt it, where the diſobedience to Authority proceeds not from perverſeneſs, but ignorance of their Duty in this particular.

Thirdly, Whereas he would have the world believe that *the omiſſion* of Ceremonies, *makes a Miniſter more liable to deprivation than Whoredom, Drunkenneſs*, &c. If he means, that it is commonly more eaſie to convict ſuch an one of Nonconformity, which muſt be open and notorious, than of immorality, which may be kept ſo ſecret as, in many caſes, ſcarcely to admit of legal proof; I deſire to know how is this to be helpt, or the Church to be blamed for it? Or, if he means, that immorality in Miniſters has not been ſo ſtrictly proſecuted and puniſhed as Nonconformity: Beſides that he offers no manner of proof even of this; the utmoſt it could amount to, if true, would be to faſten a juſt blame, not upon the Laws of the Church, but upon thoſe Perſons who ſhould have put them in execution; wherein I will join with him, with all my heart, if he can but furniſh me with ſufficient proof of the matter of fact. But if he means that, by our Eccleſiaſtical Laws, a Miniſter, who is *convicted* of ſuch immorality as he mentions, is not as liable to deprivation as he that is found guilty of Nonconformity, (which I think is the only meaning of his words, that can be any way to the purpoſe). I challenge the abominable falſehood of this aſſertion, and demand the proof of it from him.

Fourthly, Whereas he ſuggeſts that *the refuſers of Conformity*, are *judged worſe than Idolatrous Papiſts*: This is an imputation ſo notoriouſly unjuſt and immodeſt, that none but a man of ſuch a *tender Conſcience*, as our Author would ever lay it to our charge. But 'tis no matter for that, his party will probably believe that he would never affirm a thing ſo extraordinary if it were not ſo; And if he does but calumniate ſtoutly, ſomething perhaps may ſtick. But methinks this man, who ſo ſolemnly in his Preface, appeals *to the Judge that ſtandeth at the door*, ſhould remember the account, which one day he muſt give of his *words* as well as *actions*, unto that ſame Judge.

And laſtly, Whereas he accuſes us, that we eſteem our Ceremonies to *be more neceſſary than the Peace and Unity of the Church*. I Anſwer, that if any man were once *convinced* that the abolition of any Ceremonies, which lawfully may be laid aſide, would generally conduce to the Unity and Peace of the Church; and that without doing any other hurt, which might overballance this good; and if, in this caſe, he ſhould refuſe to have theſe Ceremonies aboliſhed; it might indeed juſtly be ſaid of him, that he preferred them before *Peace* and *Unity*. But where it no way appears that men are thus convinced: But on the contrary, that there is much reaſon to fear that the prohibition or diſuſe of ſuch Ceremonies, would not only give a very plauſible advantage to the Churches enemies, and ſcandalize a multitude of her own weak Members; but alſo encourage thoſe that cauſeleſly diſſent from her to inſult and triumph, and to demand other things, which are yet more unreaſonable. Where men, I ſay, are under theſe or ſuch

like

like apprehenſions (as many ſober and prudent men of our Church are); altho' a man ſhould be of opinion that they were miſtaken, yet could he not, with truth or charity, affirm, that they preferred their Ceremonies, or thought them *more neceſſary than the Peace and Unity of the Church.* For in this caſe, bare Ceremonies are not put into the Scale againſt Peace and Unity, as our Author would inſinuate: But all the evil conſequences, which would attend the abolition of our Ceremonies, are ballanced againſt the uncertain ſatisfaction which might be given to ſome miſtaken men, whoſe principles, if they are followed, muſt continually lead them into new ſcruples and exceptions, againſt all humane eſtabliſhments, in matters of Religion and the Worſhip of God.

In the concluſion of this point of Chriſtian Liberty, I had ſaid in my *Addreſs*, that *if our Liturgy were an infringement of Chriſtian Liberty, not only all other Churches were guilty of the ſame; but even the Directory, which impoſes ſome things which in themſelves are indifferent, cannot be excuſed from it.* To which, all the Anſwer that our Author gives, is, *p.* 109. to *deny, and to demand proof from all who aſſert, that the Directory requireth any Ceremonies of myſtical ſignification; or impoſeth any indifferent thing, ſave ſuch Circumſtances as nature and reaſon direct.* But is not this meer ſhuffling, thus to take no notice of the thing which I had aſſerted, and to require me to prove that which I had never affirm'd, or ſo much as inſinuated? I had no occaſion to ſpeak of any ſuch thing as *myſtical Ceremonies* or *improper Circumſtances* to be preſcribed by the *Directory*: Nor therefore ſhould he have amuſed the Reader with the mention of them. The whole force of my Argument lay plainly in this alone, that if it be a violation of Chriſtian Liberty, for order and decency's ſake, to ſettle and determine any thing, in the manner or circumſtances of God's Worſhip, which God by his own immediate Law had not determined. From hence it would follow not only that all other Churches, but even the Directory it ſelf, which does determine ſome things which God had left indifferent, muſt be guilty of the violation of Chriſtian Liberty: To which, he does not think fit to return any manner of Anſwer.

However, that our Author may not complain that I accuſe the Directory, as equally culpable with our Liturgy in the violation of Chriſtian Liberty, without giving any inſtances to make good what I ſay; It will not be amiſs here, to give an Example or two of ſuch things as I hint at for the Readers better ſatisfaction.

A fixt ſtated and perpetual compulſion to do what God has permitted us to omit, or a prohibition to do what he has made lawful for us, i.e. according to our Author, *the main violation of Chriſtian liberty*, p. 107. Now as it was lawful for the People of the Jews, to *Worſhip towards Gods Holy Temple*, where they

daily

dayly Sacrifice was offered, 2 *Chro.* 6. 26. *Pſ.* 5. 7. and 138. 2. And for *Daniel* to Worſhip *towards Jeruſalem*, *Dan.* 6. 10. As being the place where their ſolemn Devotions were to be paid, whenever they could there be perſonally preſent. By a fair parity of reaſon it is undoubtedly Lawful, for a Chriſtian to Worſhip God towards the reading desk, from whence the Prayers of the Congregation are offer'd up, and the Word of God read unto the People by the Miniſter; or towards the Pulpit, from whence the Word of God is opened and explained for our Uſe and Inſtruction; or towards the Communion Table, where we often receive the Holy Symbols of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, which are the means appointed by him, whereby we are to Communicate in the Merits of his Paſſion. Nor is there any Law of God which, either in Words or by good Conſequence, in the leaſt forbids us to expreſs this Worſhip, by the bowing our Bodies. But the Directory, p. 10, does poſitively prohibit *Adoration* (that is Worſhip) *or bowing ones ſelf towards one place or other*: which is not only to *forbid what God has made lawful*; But alſo ſeems to require that which is in it ſelf Impoſſible. For in all Acts of Adoration, as long as we have Bodies, we muſt of neceſſity turn our ſelves *towards ſome place or other*; And I deſire our Author, if he can, to ſhew me ſuch a prohibition in any part of our Liturgy. Again *God has* undoubtedly *permitted us to omit* the poſture of ſitting at the Reception of the Holy Communion; becauſe it neither appears that this was the very poſture, in which Chriſt and his Apoſtles received it; nor if it were, is there any Command that we ſhould imitate them in that Circumſtance, any more than in the time or place wherein they performed that Office; which was *after Supper* and in *an Upper Room*: But, by the Directory, Men are as much compelled to ſit, as by the liturgy to kneel, at the Holy Communion; The words of the former p. 51, that *the Table* is to be *ſo conveniently plated, that the Communicants may orderly ſit about it*, being altogether as directive, as the Rubrick of the Latter; that *the Miniſter* ſhall deliver the Communion in both kinds to the People, *all meekly kneeling*; And the words of *the Ordinance of Parliament, for the Eſtabliſhing and putting in Execution the Directory, viz.* That the Directory *ſhall be uſed, purſued, and Obſerved in all Exerciſes of the Publick Worſhip of God, in every Congregation*, &c. Being tho' Illegal, yet as injunctive as any Clauſe in either of the Acts of Uniformity, for the Uſing of the Liturgy; And laſtly, the poſture of ſitting (if I am rightly informed) having been as exactly obſerved and kept to by the Nonconformiſts, in the receiving of the Holy Communion, as that of kneeling by thoſe of the Eſtabliſhed Church: And therefore the Directory, according to our Author, muſt be as much an infringement of Chriſtian Liberty, in this alſo, as our Liturgy.

Having

Having done with the Objection which was drawn from the pretence of *Christian Liberty*; In the next place I proposed that which is raised from the pretended *numerousness* and *burthen* of our Ceremonies; to which I Answered, that *the utmost that this could amount to*, if it were true, (as I do not conceive that it is) *would be only an inconvenience, and not a sin.* To which he Replies, *p.* 109, that *God's word tells us, that to do what is not convenient is sinful*, Rom. 1. 28. Ephes. 5. 4. But is not this still meer trifling and playing with the ambiguity of a word, which I plainly take in one sense, and he wilfully mistakes in another? For whereas a thing may be said to be *inconvenient*, either first because it is *troublesome*; or secondly, because it is *unlawful*: Nothing can be more manifest, than that here I take the word *inconvenient* in the former sense only, and St. *Paul*, in the places he assigns, only in the latter. If our Ceremonies were too numerous and burthensom (as I cannot see why they should be so thought) yet this would only render them *troublesome*, and upon that account *inconvenient*, but not unlawful: Whereas it is plainly the *unlawfulness* and not the troublesomness of *unrighteousness*, *fornication*, *wickedness*, *covetousness*, &c. and of *filthiness*, and *foolish talking* and *jesting*, which makes the Apostle in the above mentioned places, to call them by the name of *inconvenient*.

But, says he, *Was not this the sin of the Pharisees*, Mat. 23, 4. that they *burthened* mens *Consciences with their own inventions?* To which I Answer, that the sin of the Pharisees in that place must needs be one or both of these, *viz.* either, first, the imposing of humane Traditions, *as a part of God's Law*, of which I have already spoken, under the Objection about Christian Liberty; or, secondly, the requiring a much more strict and exact obedience to God's Law from other People, than what they themselves performed (as appears from the two preceding verses) which was a piece of most gross Hypocrisie. But what relation this has to Rites and Ceremonies, appointed by Authority for order and decency in the Worship of God, our Author must inform me, for of my self I am not able to find it out.

In my Address I had taken notice, that *tho' St. Austin complained of the number and burthen of Ceremonies in his time, yet we never find that he looked upon that as any cause for separating from the Established Church:* Upon which he thinks he has caught me several ways: And first he demands, *why the Dissenters may not now complain* as well as St. *Austin* did in his time? To which I Answer, because they have not the same reason; the number of Ceremonies, which were brought into the Church in his days, being much greater and more perplexing than what is now in use amongst us. But yet if they now made their complaint, as he did, without breaking the Unity of the Church, or causing any Schism in it; altho' I should think that there were no reason for their so complaining; yet should I not herein accuse them as guilty of

any ſin. But our Author tells us, that if St. *Auſtin had lived in ſome places of the world, and complained of ſuch a burthen, there is a Canon called the tenth, by which he had been, ipſo facto, ſhut out of the Church.* To which I Anſwer, that neither are the words *ipſo facto* (upon which he lays ſuch weight) in the *Tenth Canon* of the Church of *England*; nor is the Excommunication there threatned, but upon a ſuppoſition that ſuch a complaint is made and *publiſhed* for the abetting and juſtifying of ſuch as make a Schiſm in the Church, by *taking to themſelves the name of another Church, not Eſtabliſhed by Law:* which farther ſhews how diſingenuous a man this is in his quotations. In the next place, he demands *how do I know that St.* Auſtin *did not ſeparate?* But was ever ſuch a Queſtion askt? Or is there the leaſt intimation either in his own or any other of the Books of that Age, that ever he did ſeparate? And if ſuch a man as he had ſeparated, is it to be imagined that great notice would not have been taken of it? Or laſtly, do I pretend to *know poſitively* that he did not ſeparate, or to ſay any more, but that *we never find* that he did? But our Author has a *dilemma*, to prove St. *Auſtin* either to have ſeparated or ſinned: For *if he refuſed to uſe* thoſe ſame Ceremonies, of which he complained, then *he ſeparated as well as the preſent Non-conformiſts:* but *if he uſed them after his complaint of their being burthenſome and too numerous, it would be hard to excuſe him from ſin.* To this I Anſwer, firſt, that many Ceremonies in St. *Auſtin*'s days, being probably introduced by meer cuſtom, without any Law or Canon to eſtabliſh and confirm them; it was certainly lawful for him, in his own Church and Dioceſs, to retrench the uſe of ſuch Ceremonies as theſe, as in prudence he might think fit; becauſe in ſtrictneſs there lay no obligation upon him at all to make uſe of them. But, ſecondly, if he had renounced and abſolutely refuſed to communicate with any Chriſtian Church whatſoever, againſt which he had no other Objection, but only that they required the uſe of ſome Ceremonies in the Worſhip of God which God had not commanded, nor yet had any way forbidden; altho' theſe Ceremonies might have been too numerous; and upon that account troubleſome; yet if he had no other juſt plea to bring againſt them, I cannot ſee how this alone could have juſtified him in breaking the Unity of the Church, which every Chriſtian is bound, as far as in him lyes, to preſerve: But that ever he did any thing like this, does not in the leaſt appear. But, Thirdly, if St. *Auſtin*, for the ſake of Peace and Unity, was content to ſubmit to the uſe of ſo many Ceremonies as, in his opinion, were too numerous, and therefore burthenſome; I deſire our Author to inform me, by what Law of God he can on this account be taxed, or with any reaſon ſo much as ſuſpected of ſin: For tho' it is not lawful to *do evil, that good may come*, Rom. 3. 8. Yet that it ſhould be any way unlawful, to do a thing which is not evil, but only troubleſome and uneaſy; when the end a man has in doing it is really

good;

good; is what no man, I think, of common ſenſe, will offer to ſay.

The laſt Objection of the Nonconformiſts, which under this head I propoſed in my *Addreſs* was, that *Our Ceremonies are unneceſſary, and therefore ought not to be impoſed.* To which I there returned a twofold Anſwer; Firſt, That *what ſome may think unneceſſary, others may judge Expedient:* Secondly, *ſuppoſing*, but not granting, *that our Governours were faulty in impoſing ſome needleſs things upon us, Yet that our Compliance even with ſuch things for Peace and Unity's ſake, would rather be a Vertue than a Sin.* In return to which he tells me firſt, that what I *dubiouſly ſuppoſe*, is a plain Truth, and in effect *confeſt* by us, *viz.* That our Ceremonies *are unneceſſary, becauſe we declare them to be indifferent.* But will this Man never leave Trifling with the Ambiguity of Words? If by *unneceſſary*, he means *not abſolutely and perpetually neceſſary to Salvation*; I grant, that every indifferent thing is in this Senſe *unneceſſary*: But if by unneceſſary, he means *altogether uſeleſs and inſignificant to any good purpoſe*; I deny that what is in it's own nature indifferent, is always thus to be judged *unneceſſary*. For there may be ſuch Circumſtances of things and Perſons, wherein ſuch things may be Inſtruments and occaſions of much good: And accordingly, it is very evident, that the retaining of the uſe of ſome indifferent things in our Church, did not a little contribute to the advancing of the Reformation amongſt us, and bringing over many thereto, who otherwiſe would not probably have ſo eaſily forſaken Popery: And I have already given my Reaſons why it is not fit or proper, as matters ſtand, wholly now to lay all ſuch things aſide.

In the next place he tells me, That *he knows of no Command of Chriſt for complying with Governours, in their unneceſſary impoſitions, for the ſake of Peace and Unity; and therefore he will not own it to be a Vertue rather than a Sin.* I am ſorry that he is ſo ignorant of the Laws of the Goſpel: But, ſeriouſly, has he never heard of a Command of Chriſt, which the Apoſtle thus delivers to us, *If it be poſſible as much as lyeth in you live Peaceably with all Men*: Rom. 12. 18. If then a thing be otherwiſe never ſo unneceſſary, yet *if it be poſſible*; and if no Law of God has forbidden it, but that it *lyeth in us*, and we are at liberty to do it; we ought to comply with it, if it be neceſſary in order to Peace. Or has he never met with another Command, which S. *Paul* thus ſets down, *Rom.* 13. 1. *Let every Soul be ſubject to the higher Powers*; And S. *Peter* thus, *Submit your ſelves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lords ſake*, 1 *Pet.* 2. 13. And to which there is no other exception made in the whole word of God, but only this, that *we ought to obey God rather than Men? Acts* 5. 29. If then a thing be commanded by the *higher Powers*, and *Ordained* by the Authority of thoſe *Men*, in whom the Legiſlature reſides; However unneceſſary it may be thought to be; yet ſtill it is to be *ſubmitted to*, except it appears to be forbidden by ſome Law of Almighty God. But our

Author

Author it seems would bring Government to a very Fine pass, when he would make every private Man to be Judge, not only whether the thing Commanded be agreeable to the Law of God; but also whether there were any necessity for issuing such a Command at all; before he shall lye under any Obligation to give Obedience to it.

But *Church-Governours*, says he, *are obliged to teach us, to observe no more than what Christ Commanded them*, *Mat.* 28. 20. *Acts* 10. 33. I grant it. But what can be more plain than that the Apostles, who were the first Governors appointed by Christ to his Church, did teach all men to observe the Lawful Commands of Lawful Authority? And will our Author say that they had no Command from Christ for doing this? But says he again, *they have no Power to impose things needless.* I answer, that they who have the Power of making Laws, ought not indeed to enact such Laws, as impose things altogether useless to any good purpose: Nor are there any of our Church Constitutions, but what, if they were duly respected and observed, would tend very much to Order and Decency; and also *to keep out unnecessary Innovations*; and therefore they cannot justly be termed *needless things.* But if I should Judge them to be altogether *needless*; Yet, as long as they are *innocent*, this would be no good Reason, why I should refuse Obedience to them; as well because I have no Warrant from Gods word for so doing; as that the Government in their Wisdom, may have very good reason for Commanding such things, altho', it may be, I am not able throughly to comprehend it. And that *such* a modest *compliance* as this should be judged no less than *a Conspiracy with Men usurping Power*, is such an imagination as no Man of Reason or Charity could ever entertain.

Well! But did not *Paul withstand* Peter *to the Face*, *in his imposing unnecessary things on the Jews*, *Gal.* 2. 11. But will this Man never make any Conscience of *imposing*, not only impertinent but false Allegations of the Holy Scripture, upon his unwary Reader? S. *Paul* in the place mention'd, did indeed withstand S. *Peter*: But not on account of his *Imposing* any thing *on the Jews* (of which there is not there the least shadow of a suggestion) But purely for his *Dissimulation*, in that by *withdrawing* and *separating himself* from *the Gentiles*, for *fear* of *them which were of the Circumcision*; he laid a stumbling Block before the Gentiles; And, tho' not by his Doctrine, yet by his Example seemed to put a sort of *Compulsion* upon them, *to live as did the Jews*; to which no Law either of God or Man did oblige them. And, as to what he immediately Adds; I grant with him that the *Authority which the Lord hath given* unto the Church is *for Edification*, 2 *Cor.* 10. 8. To which I must tell him, that a setled Decency and Order in the Circumstances of Worship, does not a little conduce. I grant also, that where a Church ceases to *follow Christ*, we ought not therein to follow that Church, according to the

Apostles

Apoſtles Doctrine, 1 *Cor.* 11. 1. But where the Church is careful to follow Chriſt in all manner of things that are neceſſary, and therein to the utmoſt to promote the Edification of all her Members, why it ſhould be a Sin to Comply with that Church, for Peace and Unity's ſake, in ſuch things as are indifferent, and therefore Lawful; or why a Man ſhould Renounce the Communion of ſuch a Church, on account of ſuch things, even in caſe they were needleſs; I cannot in the leaſt gather from either of thoſe places: And, whereas he tells us that *the Synod of* Jeruſalem, *Acts* 15, *thought fit to impoſe nothing but neceſſary things*, Verſe 28. I deſire to know in what Senſe was the *abſtaining from Meats offered to Idols, and from blood, and from things ſtrangled*, at that time *neceſſary?* If they were abſolutely neceſſary as eſſential parts of Gods Law, how comes S. *Paul* to teach the lawfulneſs of eating that which had been offered to an Idol, provided it were done without any Worſhip to the Idol, or Scandal given to weak Brethren? 1 *Cor.* chap 8. and chap 10. And how came our Saviour ſo expreſsly to aſſure us, and in ſuch general Terms, that *not that which goeth into the Mouth defileth a Man? Matt.* 15. 11. But if they were in themſelves indifferent, and neceſſary only in order to reconcile the Jews, (who laid great Weight upon theſe things) and to bring them to a more favourable opinion of the Gentile Chriſtians, which I believe our Author will not deny; how can the Example of this Synod be alledged to Condemn, and not rather to juſtifie, the practiſe of the Eſtabliſhed Church; which has retained and kept up the uſe of ſome things, in themſelves likewiſe indifferent; becauſe they conceived them neceſſary and proper to reconcile thoſe of the Church of *Rome* (who by long cuſtom had entertained a great reſpect for them) and to beget in them a better opinion of the Reformation? And laſtly, as to what he quotes out of my Lord Primate *Bramhall's Vindication*; I freely grant, that no man ought to ſuffer an *Erroneous Opinion* to be *impoſed* upon him, becauſe as it is impoſſible for him to believe what he judges to be Erroneous; ſo to profeſs what he does not believe, would be a lye and a ſin: But the conſequence which he would ſuggeſt from a ſuppoſed parity, between an *Erroneous Opinion* and an *Indifferent* (and therefore innocent) *Ceremony* or Circumſtance, is altogether weak and groundleſs.

The fourth main Propoſition which I have inſiſted on in my Addreſs is, that *ſince the Communion of our Church is lawful and innocent in it ſelf* (which, I hope, I have now abundantly proved againſt all that our Author has Objected to the contrary) *there cannot be any juſt reaſon why the Nonconformiſts ſhould refuſe to join with us in it.* And altho' our Author nibbles a little, at ſome of thoſe things which I have touched under this head of my Diſcourſe; yet ſince every thing, which he there ſays, is either not to the purpoſe, or elſe proceeds upon a ſuppoſition that our Communion is *not lawful and innocent in it ſelf*

Author it seems would bring Government to a very Fine pass, when he would make every private Man to be Judge, not only whether the thing Commanded be agreeable to the Law of God; but also whether there were any necessity for issuing such a Command at all; before he shall lye under any Obligation to give Obedience to it.

But *Church-Governours*, says he, *are obliged to teach us, to observe no more than what Christ Commanded them*, *Mat.* 28. 20. *Acts* 10. 33. I grant it. But what can be more plain than that the Apostles, who were the first Governors appointed by Christ to his Church, did teach all men to observe the Lawful Commands of Lawful Authority? And will our Author say that they had no Command from Christ for doing this? But says he again, *they have no Power to impose things needless.* I answer, that they who have the Power of making Laws, ought not indeed to enact such Laws, as impose things altogether useless to any good purpose: Nor are there any of our Church Constitutions, but what, if they were duly respected and observed, would tend very much to Order and Decency; and also *to keep out unnecessary Innovations*; and therefore they cannot justly be termed *needless things.* But if I should Judge them to be altogether *needless*; Yet, as long as they are *innocent*, this would be no good Reason, why I should refuse Obedience to them; as well because I have no Warrant from Gods word for so doing; as that the Government in their Wisdom, may have very good reason for Commanding such things, altho', it may be, I am not able throughly to comprehend it. And that *such* a modest *compliance* as this should be judged no less than *a Conspiracy with Men usurping Power*, is such an imagination as no Man of Reason or Charity could ever entertain.

Well! But did not *Paul withstand* Peter *to the Face, in his imposing unnecessary things on the Jews*, *Gal.* 2. 11. But will this Man never make any Conscience of *imposing*, not only impertinent but false Allegations of the Holy Scripture, upon his unwary Reader? S. *Paul* in the place mention'd, did indeed withstand S. *Peter*: But not on account of his *Imposing* any thing *on the Jews* (of which there is not there the least shadow of a suggestion) But purely for his *Dissimulation*, in that by *withdrawing* and *separating himself* from *the Gentiles*, for *fear* of *them which were of the Circumcision*; he laid a stumbling Block before the Gentiles; And, tho' not by his Doctrine, yet by his Example seemed to put a sort of *Compulsion* upon them, *to live as did the Jews*; to which no Law either of God or Man did oblige them. And, as to what he immediately Adds; I grant with him that the *Authority which the Lord hath given* unto the Church is *for Edification*, 2 *Cor.* 10. 8. To which I must tell him, that a setled Decency and Order in the Circumstances of Worship, does not a little conduce. I grant also, that where a Church ceases to *follow Christ*, we ought not therein to follow that Church, according to the

Apostles

Apostles Doctrine, 1 *Cor.* 11. 1. But where the Church is careful to follow Christ in all manner of things that are necessary, and therein to the utmost to promote the Edification of all her Members, why it should be a Sin to Comply with that Church, for Peace and Unity's sake, in such things as are indifferent, and therefore Lawful; or why a Man should Renounce the Communion of such a Church, on account of such things, even in case they were needless; I cannot in the least gather from either of those places: And, whereas he tells us that *the Synod of* Jerusalem, *Acts* 15, *thought fit to impose nothing but necessary things*, Verse 28. I desire to know in what Sense was the *abstaining from Meats offered to Idols, and from blood, and from things strangled*, at that time *necessary?* If they were absolutely necessary as essential parts of Gods Law, how comes S. *Paul* to teach the lawfulness of eating that which had been offered to an Idol, provided it were done without any Worship to the Idol, or Scandal given to weak Brethren? 1 *Cor.* chap 8. and chap 10. And how came our Saviour so expressly to assure us, and in such general Terms, that *not that which goeth into the Mouth defileth a Man? Matt.* 15. 11. But if they were in themselves indifferent, and necessary only in order to reconcile the Jews, (who laid great Weight upon these things) and to bring them to a more favourable opinion of the Gentile Christians, which I believe our Author will not deny; how can the Example of this Synod be alledged to Condemn, and not rather to justifie, the practise of the Established Church; which has retained and kept up the use of some things, in themselves likewise indifferent; because they conceived them necessary and proper to reconcile those of the Church of *Rome* (who by long custom had entertained a great respect for them) and to beget in them a better opinion of the Reformation? And lastly, as to what he quotes out of my Lord Primate *Bramhall's Vindication*; I freely grant, that no man ought to suffer an *Erroneous Opinion* to be *imposed* upon him, because as it is impossible for him to believe what he judges to be Erroneous; so to profess what he does not believe, would be a lye and a sin: But the consequence which he would suggest from a supposed parity, between an *Erroneous Opinion* and an *Indifferent* (and therefore innocent) *Ceremony* or Circumstance, is altogether weak and groundless.

The fourth main Proposition which I have insisted on in my Address is, that *since the Communion of our Church is lawful and innocent in it self* (which, I hope, I have now abundantly proved against all that our Author has Objected to the contrary) *there cannot be any just reason why the Nonconformists should refuse to join with us in it.* And altho' our Author nibbles a little, at some of those things which I have touched under this head of my Discourse; yet since every thing, which he there says, is either not to the purpose, or else proceeds upon a supposition that our Communion is *not lawful and innocent in it self*

(which clearly alters the ſtate of the caſe, and the contrary whereto I have hitherto been aſſerting againſt all his weak and trifling Objections), I will not give either my ſelf or the Reader the trouble of making any Remarks upon the particulars of what he offers on this occaſion; only as to that paſſage of Dr. *Holden's*, which he cites out of my Lord Primate *Bramhall*, p. 113. I think it enough to ſay, that altho' it may be *leſs criminal* for one National Church, *upon account of ſome doubtful Opinions*, or ſuch like things, to refuſe the Communion of ſuch another Church (the obligation of whoſe particular Laws or Canons can only extend to its own members), than for ſubjects to diſobey thoſe Laws which are Enacted by their own lawful ſuperiors; and thereby to make a Schiſm in the very body of that National Church, of which they are or ought to be members: Yet ſince the obligation to Eccleſiaſtical Union and Communion is univerſal, and extends unto all Chriſtians and Churches whatſoever; wherever there is any ſeparation or breach of Communion, made between any Perſons, Churches, or Congregations, there muſt of neceſſity be a ſin on the one ſide or other; namely, on their part who give a juſt cauſe for breaking Communion, or on theirs who break it without any ſuch cauſe given: And this ſin is what I call by the name of a Schiſm.

Having thus abundantly vindicated *my Doctrine*, I come now, in the laſt place of all, to that which our Author calls the *uſe* of it: In which my deſign was not (as he he ſuggeſts) *to diſſwade the Non-Conformiſts from the thoughts of a Legal Toleration*; but only from the thoughts of ſuch a Toleration as might probably prove to be of dangerous conſequence to the Eſtabliſht Church; if not to the Civil State alſo. And therefore, in Anſwer to all that our Author has offered upon this occaſion, I think it is enough for me to ſay, that I am not, nor ever was, againſt their having a full and free allowance to Worſhip God in their own way; or for cutting them ſhort in any advantages, which are conſiſtent with the publick peace and ſecurity of the Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Eſtabliſhment; and if they deſire more than this, I appeal to all indifferent men whether it be reaſonable for the Government to grant it to them.

But before I make an end, I muſt take the pains to wipe off a little dirt, which our Author here alſo endeavours to caſt, as well upon me in particular, as upon the Eſtablibliſhed Church in general.

Firſt then he tells me, p. 115. That I *have low thoughts of Salvation*; and *rate it lower than employments of truſt and profit upon Earth*: For the former *I ſeem to grant them liberty to ſeek*; But the latter *I would Monopolize to our own Party*. But where I pray is the conſequence of this Argument? That I apprehend it as a thing of more dangerous conſequence to our ſafety and ſecurity, to admit the Nonconformiſts to a ſhare in the Government, than barely

barely to permit them to seek for Eternal Salvation in their own way; is a truth that may well be gathered from what I have suggested in my Address. But that therefore I set a greater value upon Temporal Employments, than upon everlasting Salvation, is what no Man but one of our Authors Logick and Charity, would pretend to infer from any thing that I have said. But that I *would deprive them of the Ordinary means of subsisting and serving God and their Country*; which he there also lays to my Charge, but does not pretend to prove; is such a bare-fac'd calumny, as no one but a Man that wanted Conscience or Consideration, would ever offer to load me with: For he who has but half an Eye, may very plainly see that it is very possible, and very *ordinary* too, for Men to subsist comfortably and grow Rich, and *serve God and their Country* faithfully in a private Station, without ever being put into any place of Power and Authority.

He tells me, presently after, That *the Church may stand, tho' she don't inhance all Offices of Power, Trust and Profit. These are not the Rock, on which Christ built his Church.* But whoever said they were; Or to what purpose is this uncharitable insinuation? I do not doubt or distrust the good Providence and protection of Almighty God: But I cannot think it Reasonable willingly to put a Power into any Mans hands, which I have reason to fear that he will employ to my hurt, whenever he has a fair opportunity for it. Well! but *that their design is not to overthrow our Church, is evident; because they have not moved for the withdrawing either Power or Profit from us.* But how shall we be secure, that they or their successors never will make such a motion, or entertain such a design? If they judge our legal Establishment to be lawful, why do they not conform to it? But if unlawful, are they not then in Conscience bound to use their best endeavours to get it altered.

But whereas I had objected that the Presbyterian Party had formerly in all the three Kingdoms; and again lately in one of them, actually overthrown the Establish't Episcopal Church; And that therefore there is much reason to fear that, if not at present, yet in succeeding times they may, if not carefully prevented, do the same thing again in this Kingdom; our Author, instead of offering us any manner of security against such an impendent evil; freely supposes the truth of what I have said, and tells me, p. 117. That *tho' all this should come to pass, yet it is severe justice to punish the Predecessors, for the probable faults of the Successors, not as yet committed: In Hell there is more justice, where Men are only punisht for real and past Crimes.* Which is plainly in other words to say, that tho' we clearly foresee the ruine of our selves, or our Posterity, by granting all that the Nonconformists desire; yet we must not take any care to prevent it. Here is a sample of those *modest Petitions* of which our Author speaks in his Preface. But the Objection it self is most weak and foolish. For altho' it is not just to *punish* any

any Man for a Crime not as yet committed; yet to prevent Men from committing a crime into which it is likely that they may run; and by such prudent caution, to save the Church and State from confusion or ruine; was never, I believe, accounted as a piece of Injustice: And more than this I never thought of, or pleaded for.

But, says our Author, *the Consequences of denying this Toleration desired, will be hurtful*, viz. 1. *The discouraging of many industrious and profitable Subjects.* 2. *The alienating the affections of all sober men from Church-men, who are the sole opposers of this desire.* 3. *An Impossibility ever hereafter to induce the Non-Conformists to join with us, if there should be occasion for their service.* All which I grant might have a fair appearance of truth, if so be that a Toleration were really denyed to the Non-Conformists. But since the case is quite otherwise, and that a free and legal Toleration is offered them, upon the very same terms with which those of their perswasion in *England* are well satisfied; which is as great an encouragement as can be to every thing, except the ambition of a few Leading-men among them: If this Toleration be refused by themselves; and if the Penal Laws, which are still in force in this Kingdom, should ever hereafter come to be put in Execution against them; I desire to know who but their own Leading-men will be to be blamed for it? Who it seems are not contented to have their *industrious Labourers, ingenious Artists, and honest Traders* (as our Author speaks of them in his Preface, secured from trouble, and encouraged in their honest employments; if they at the same time must be excluded from offices of power and trust in the Civil State. So that the true and only reason why an Act of Toleration is not here passed as well as in *England*, is because a few men among the Non-Conformists do obstinately refuse to sacrifice their ambition to the peace and safety of their Brethren.

But our Author taxes us with *ungrateful breaking the promises which we made to the* Non-conformists, *and discovering heart-enmity against them.* But when he thus draws up his Indictments, he ought to produce his proofs; for he has hitherto given us no great reason to believe him upon his bare word. It was, and I think is still, the opinion of all sober men among us, that the Non-Conformists ought to have a free Toleration upon such terms as may be consistent with the safety of the Established Church and Civil State; (which shews that we bear no *heart-enmity* against them) and 'tis, I think, their own fault if they refuse it. But if more than this was ever promised them by us; I desire our Author to let us know when, and by whom, and what Authority they had to make such promises to them.

As for the buffoon story of *a fool, a quart of ale, and a gallows at the Bridge of Stirling*, with which our Author concludes his Book: All that I can gather from it is, that, notwithstanding all his pretences to Sanctity and tenderness of Conscience, he is not a man of that seriousness which becomes a Minister of the Gospel: Otherwise he would never have so impertinently pulled in such a nonsensical piece in a matter of such weighty concern as the Peace and Unity of the Church. And *thus I* likewise *conclude that there can be no harm done by his answer to my Address*; except men will be so foolish as to be imposed on by a huddle of Sophistry and Calumny, without any manner of sound or solid Proof.

4 OC 38

FINIS.